arXiv:1704.02279v1 [math.DG] 7 Apr 2017

ALGEBRAIC FIBER SPACES AND CURVATURE OF HIGHER DIRECT IMAGES

BO BERNDTSSON, MIHAI PĂUN AND XU WANG

ABSTRACT. Let $p : X \to Y$ be an algebraic fiber space, and let L be a line bundle on X. In this article we obtain a curvature formula for the higher direct images of $\Omega^i_{X/Y} \otimes L$ restricted to a suitable Zariski open subset of X. The proof is very natural in case L is semi-negatively curved on X and strictly negative on fibers of p. Several applications are obtained, including a proof of a result by Viehweg-Zuo in the context of a canonically polarized family of maximal variation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $p : X \to Y$ be a holomorphic map of relative dimension n between two non-singular, projective manifolds. We denote by $\Delta \subset Y$ the union of codimension one components of the set of singular values of p, and we will use the same notation for the associated divisor. The reduced divisor corresponding to the support of the inverse $p^{-1}(\Delta)$ will be denoted by W. In order to formulate our results, we will assume from the very beginning that Δ and W have simple normal crossings.

We denote by $\Omega^1_X\langle W\rangle$ and $\Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle$ the logarithmic co-tangent bundle associated to (X, W) and (Y, Δ) respectively (cf. [10] and the references therein). The pull-back of forms with log poles along Δ gives an injective map of sheaves

$$p^\star\Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \to \Omega^1_X\langle W\rangle. \tag{1.1}$$

Let $\Omega^1_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle$ be the co-kernel of the map (1.1).
We consider a Hermitian line bundle (L, h_L) on X. The metric h_L is assumed to be smooth when restricted to the generic fibers of p. The curvature of (L, h_L) will be denoted by Θ_L.

In this article our primary goal is to explore the differential geometric properties of the higher direct images

$$\mathcal{R}^i p_\star \left(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right) \tag{1.2}$$

where $n \geq i \geq 1$. This will be done in two steps, as follows.

(A) *Restriction to the set of regular values* By a fundamental result of Grauert [2], the sheaves (1.2) are coherent, thus locally free on a Zariski open subset of Y.

The set of singular values of the map p will be denoted by $\Sigma \subset Y$. Then the complement $\Sigma \setminus \Delta$ is a union of algebraic subsets of Y of codimension at least two. For each $i = 1, \ldots, n$ we consider the function

$$t \to h^i(X_t, \Omega^{n-i}_{X_t} \otimes L_t), \tag{1.3}$$

defined on $Y \setminus \Sigma$. These functions are upper semicontinuous, hence constant on a Zariski open subset of Y which will be denoted by B.

The set $p^{-1}(B) \subset X$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{X}$, and we will use the same symbol $p : \mathcal{X} \to B$ for the restriction to $\mathcal{X}$ of our initial map. It is a proper holomorphic submersion and the restriction of (1.2) to B is equal to

$$\mathcal{R}^i p_\star\big(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\big)|_B = \mathcal{R}^i p_\star\big(\Omega^{n-i}_{\mathcal{X}/B} \otimes L\big). \tag{1.4}$$

We denote the vector bundle (1.4) by $\mathcal{H}^{i,n-i}$. Its fiber at t is isomorphic to the Dolbeault cohomology space $H^i(X_t, \Omega^{n-i}_{X_t} \otimes L_t)$.

Let $V \subset B$ be a coordinate open subset (with respect to the ordinary topology), and let

$$[u] : t \to [u_t] \in H^i(X_t, \Omega^{n-i}_{X_t} \otimes L_t)$$

be a local section of the bundle $\mathcal{H}^{i,n-i} \to B$, where each u_t is a $\bar\partial$-closed L_t-valued $(i, n-i)$-form on X_t and $[u_t]$ denotes its $\bar\partial$-cohomology class. We denote by ω a smooth $(1,1)$-form on X, whose restriction to the fibers of p is positive definite. Then one may use $\omega|_{X_t}$ and h_L to define a Hermitian norm on $\mathcal{H}^{i,n-i}$, more precisely, the norm of a class $[u_t]$ will be defined as the L^2-norm of its unique $\bar\partial$-harmonic representative, say $u_{t,h}$, i.e.

$$\|[u]\|^2_t := \int_{\mathcal{X}_t} |u_{t,h}|^2 e^{-\varphi}\omega^n/n! \tag{1.5}$$

By a fundamental result of Kodaira-Spencer the variation of $u_{t,h}$ with respect to t is smooth.

As we have recalled above, the bundle $\Omega^{n-i}_{\mathcal{X}/B} \otimes L$ is a quotient of $\Omega^{n-i}_{\mathcal{X}} \otimes L$, and we can construct (cf. section 2) a smooth $(0,i)$-form $\widetilde{u}$ with values in $\Omega^{n-i}_{\mathcal{X}} \otimes L|_{p^{-1}(V)}$ which is $\bar\partial$-closed on the fibers of p and whose restriction to each X_t belongs to the cohomology class $[u_t]$. In what follows $\widetilde{u}$ will be called a *representative* of $[u]$.

In section 3 we show that the complex structure on $\mathcal{H}^{i,n-i}$ can be described by using the representatives $\widetilde{u}$ of a smooth section $[u]$. Let $t_1, \ldots, t_m$ be local coordinates centered at some point $y_0 \in Y$. The form $\bar\partial\widetilde{u}$ can be written as follows

$$\bar\partial\widetilde{u} = \sum_{j=1}^m dt_j \wedge \eta_j + \sum_{j=1}^m d\overline{t}_j \wedge \nu_j \tag{1.6}$$

and it turns out that u is holomorphic if and only if the restriction $\nu_j|_{\mathcal{X}_t}$ is $\bar\partial$-exact for each t. We remark that in the usual setting, i.e. if L is trivial, the complex structure defined in 1.6 is obtained by applying the (0,1) part of the Gauss-Manin connection, followed by the projection to the space $\mathcal{H}^{i,n-i}$.

Summing up, $\mathcal{H}^{i,n-i}$ is a holomorphic Hermitian vector bundle. The sign of the corresponding curvature form is of fundamental importance in applications. Certainly, the curvature tensor is an intrinsic object, completely determined by the complex and the Hermitian structure of the bundle. Nevertheless, it can be presented in many ways, depending on the choice of the representatives $\widetilde{u}$ mentioned above. So an important question would be to choose “the best" representative for the holomorphic sections of $\mathcal{H}^{i,n-i}$.

We assume that the curvature Θ_L of (L, h_L) is semi-negative on X and strictly negative on the fibers of $p : \mathcal{X} \to B$. In this case, we can take $\omega := -\Theta_L$. Another consequence of this assumption is the existence of a *vertical representative* corresponding to any section u (cf. section 5). The vertical representatives are used in the proof of our first main result, namely Theorem 6.1. We show that the curvature of $\mathcal{H}^{i,n-i}$ evaluated in a direction u can be written as difference of two semi-positive forms on the base B. Roughly speaking, the positive contribution in the expression of the curvature is given by the contraction (or cup-product) with the Kodaira-Spencer class.

Rather than stating Theorem 6.1 here, we mention one of its consequences, which will be important in applications. Let $\mathcal{K}^i$ be the kernel of the map

$$\mathcal{R}^i p_\star\big(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\big) \to \mathcal{R}^{i+1} p_\star\big(\Omega^{n-i-1}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\big) \otimes \Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \tag{1.7}$$

defined by contraction with the Kodaira-Spencer class. By shrinking B, we can assume that the restriction $\mathcal{K}^i|_B$ is a sub-bundle of $\mathcal{R}^i p_\star\big(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\big)|_B$. We have the following statement.

Theorem 1.1. *We assume that $\Theta_L \leq 0$ on X and that $\Theta_L|_{\mathcal{X}_t} < 0$ for any $t \in B$. Then the bundle $\mathcal{K}^i|_B$ endowed with the metric induced from* (1.5) *is semi-negative in the sense of Griffiths, provided that we choose $\omega|_{\mathcal{X}_t} = -\Theta_L|_{\mathcal{X}_t}$.*

We list next a few other results related to Theorem 6.1. For example, assume that the canonical bundle $K_{\mathcal{X}_t}$ of $\mathcal{X}_t$ is ample (i.e. the family p is canonically polarized). Then, by a crucial theorem of Aubin and Yau ([1], [41]), we can construct a metric $h_t = e^{-\psi_t}$ on $K_{\mathcal{X}_t}$ such that $\omega_t = \sqrt{-1}\partial\bar\partial\psi_t$ is Kähler-Einstein. By a result of Schumacher, [30], the metric on the relative canonical bundle $K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ induced by the family $\big(e^{-\psi_t}\big)_{t\in B}$ is semi-positively curved. We then consider the induced metric on $L := -K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$. Our formula in this case coincides with earlier results of Siu, [31], Schumacher, [30] and To-Yeung, [33].

During the (long) preparation of this paper, the article [24] by Naumann was posted on arXiv. In this work the Theorem 6.1 is equally established. The author shows that the expression of the curvature of $\mathcal{H}^{i,n-i}$ can be derived by a method similar to Schumacher's, [30]. Our approach here is very different and perhaps lighter technically. It can be seen as a generalization of the computations in [3] and [4] for the case of $\mathcal{H}^{n,0}$ (or better say, $\mathcal{H}^{0,n}$). In section 8 we also apply this method to give an alternative proof of the result of Schumacher [30] on variations of Kähler-Einstein metrics mentioned above, as well as a generalization of this to twisted Kähler-Einstein metrics by the second author, [25].

If the form Θ_L is not necessarily strictly negative on fibers of p, then things are considerably more subtle, since we cannot use the curvature form of L to define the metric. The curvature of the bundles $\mathcal{H}^{i,n-i}$ is then evaluated in section 8, using yet another method, from [38].

Actually, we obtain formulas in a more general setting, e.g. in case L is a vector bundle and we also consider bundles $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ where $p + q \neq n$. In the most general case however, the formulas are a bit less explicit than before.

(B) *Extension across the singularities.* Consider the kernel

$$\mathcal{K}^i \subset \mathcal{R}^i p_\star\big(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\big) \tag{1.8}$$

of the map (1.7). Then each $\mathcal{K}^i$ is a coherent sheaf of ${}_Y$-modules but unlike in the untwisted case $L = {}_X$, it is not clear whether $\mathcal{K}^i$ is torsion free or not (cf. [40]). Fortunately, this is not a problem for us. We define

$$\mathcal{K}^i_f := \mathcal{K}^i / T(\mathcal{K}^i) \tag{1.9}$$

where $T(\mathcal{K}^i) \subset \mathcal{K}^i$ is the torsion subsheaf. It turns out that the metric induced on $\mathcal{K}^i_f|_B$ is also semi-negatively curved in the sense of Griffiths (the quotient map $\mathcal{K}^i \to \mathcal{K}^i_f$ is an isometry). Our goal in section 9 is to show that the metric defined on the bundles $\mathcal{K}^i_f|_B$ extends as a semi-negatively curved singular Hermitian metric on the torsion-free sheaf $\mathcal{K}^i_f$, provided that the metric h_L satisfies one of the two conditions below.

$(\mathcal{H}_1)$ We have $\Theta_L \leq 0$ on X and moreover $\Theta_L|_{X_y} = 0$ for each y in the complement of some Zariski closed set.

$(\mathcal{H}_2)$ We have $\Theta_L \leq 0$ on X and moreover there exists a Kähler metric ω_Y on Y such that we have $\Theta_L \wedge p^\star\omega_Y^m \leq -\varepsilon_0\omega \wedge p^\star\omega_Y^m$ on X.

Thus the first condition requires L to be semi-negative and trivial on fibers, whereas in $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ we assume that L is uniformly strictly negative on fibers, in the sense that we have

$$\Theta_{h_L}(L)|_{X_y} \leq -\varepsilon_0\omega|_{X_y} \tag{1.10}$$

for any regular value y of the map p.

In this context we have the following result (= Theorem 9.2).

Theorem 1.2. *Let $p : X \to Y$ be an algebraic fiber space, and let (L, h_L) be a Hermitian line bundle which satisfies one of the hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_i)$ above. We assume that the restriction of h_L to the generic fiber of p is non-singular. Then:*

(a) *For each $i \geq 1$ the sheaf $\mathcal{K}^i_f$ admits a semi-negatively curved singular Hermitian metric.*

(b) *We assume that curvature form of L is smaller than $-\varepsilon_0 p^\star\omega_Y$ on the p-inverse image of some open subset $\Omega \subset Y$ of Y. Then the metric on $\mathcal{K}^i_f$ is strongly negatively curved on Ω (and semi-negatively curved outside a codimension greater than two subset of Y).*

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is not difficult, but a bit too technical to be described here. We are using the results from sections 2-8 together with a perturbation method and some properties of psh functions. As a consequence of the point (a), we infer e.g. that the dual sheaf $\mathcal{K}^{i\star}_f$ is weakly semi-positive in the sense of Viehweg, cf. [34].
We note that similar statements appear in various contexts in algebraic geometry, cf. [7], [12], [13], [16], [18], [22], [23], [27], [28], [35], [36], [40] among many others. The fundamental results of Cattani-Kaplan-Schmid [9] are an indispensable tool in the arguments of most of the articles quoted above. Unfortunately, the analogue of the period mapping is our context is not defined (because of the twisting with the bundle L) so we do not have these techniques at our disposal.

Part of the motivation for the analysis of the curvature properties of the kernels $\mathcal{K}^i$ is explained by Theorem 9.4, which shows the existence of a non-trivial map

$$\mathcal{K}_f^{i\star} \to \mathrm{Sym}^i \Omega_Y^1\langle\Delta\rangle$$

provided that a certain technical condition on the map p and the bundle L is satisfied (cf. hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_3)$ in section 9). We refer to [36], [28] for related results.

We mention next an interesting application of these results and techniques. In case of a canonically polarized family p with maximal variation we show that the bundle

$$L := \det \Omega_{X/Y}^1\langle W\rangle$$

has a property which is very similar to the hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ above, cf. Theorem 9.5 and Corollary 9.7. These results, combined with Theorem 1.2 are used to give a new proof of a famous result by Viehweg-Zuo [36] concerning the existence of big subsheaves in $\mathrm{Sym}^q \Omega_Y\langle\Delta\rangle$, see Theorem 9.8.

On the other hand, in the article [28], Popa-Schnell obtain a vast generalization of the result by Viehweg-Zuo [36] in the case of a family p whose generic fiber is of general type. To this end, they use deep results from the theory of Hodge modules. It would be very interesting to see if our explicit considerations here could provide an alternative argument. Our statement 9.4 points in this direction, as we explain after the proof of this result in section 9.

This paper is organized as follows.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Preliminaries 6
3. The bundles $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ 9
4. The horizontal lift. 11
5. Good representatives 13
5.1. Vertical representatives and the Kodaira-Spencer tensor. 14
6. The curvature formulas 17
7. Special features of the Kähler-Einstein case 20
8. More general curvature formulas 23
8.1. Quasi-vector bundles 24
8.2. Quasi-vector bundle structure and Chern connection on $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$ 26
8.3. General curvature formulas 29
8.4. Flat case 32
9. Extension of the metric 33
9.1. Notations, conventions and statements 33
9.2. Proof of Theorem 9.2 39
9.3. Proof of Theorem 9.4. 45
9.4. Metrics on the relative canonical bundle 47
9.5. Proof of Theorem 9.5 50
9.6. Proof of Theorem 9.8 50

2. Preliminaries

As in the introduction we let $p : \mathcal{X} \to B$ be a smooth proper fibration of relative dimension n over an m-dimensional base B. We let $L \to \mathcal{X}$ be a holomorphic line bundle, equipped with a smooth metric, ϕ. Mostly we will assume that ϕ has semi-negative curvature, and that $\Omega : -i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi$ is strictly positive on each fiber X_t. Sometimes we let ω_t denote the restriction of Ω to the fiber X_t, sometimes we just write ω.

We consider maps $t \to u_t$ defined for t in B, where u_t is an n form on X_t for each t. We call such a map a *section*, of the bundle of n-forms on the fiber. We will need to define what it means for such a map to be smooth.

If $t = (t_1, ...t_m)$ are local coordinates we can, via the map p consider t_j to be functions on $\mathcal{X}$, and similarily we have the forms dt_j, $d\bar{t}_j$, $dt = dt_1 \wedge ...dt_m$ and $d\bar{t}$ on $\mathcal{X}$. That p is a smooth fibration means that its differential is surjective everywhere, so locally near a point x in $\mathcal{X}$, we can complete the t_j:s with functions $z_1, ...z_n$ to get local coordinates on $\mathcal{X}$. Then, for t fixed, z_j are local coordinates on X_t, and we can write

$$u_t = \sum_{|I|=p,|J|=q} c_{I,J}(t,z) dz_I \wedge d\bar{z}_J.$$

We say that u_t is smooth if the coefficients $c_{I,J}$ are smooth. Since this amounts to saying that the form on $\mathcal{X}$

$$u_t \wedge dt \wedge d\bar{t}$$

is smooth, it does not depend on the choice of coordinates.

Lemma 2.1. *A section u_t is smooth if and only if there is a smooth n-form, $\tilde{u}$ on $\mathcal{X}$, such that the restriction of $\tilde{u}$ to each X_t equals u_t.*

Proof. Locally, this is clear from the discussion above: we may take $\tilde{u} = \sum c_{I,J} dz_I \wedge d\bar{z}_J$. The global case follows via a partition of unity. □

These definitions extend to forms with values in L. We will call a form $\tilde{u}$ as in the lemma a *representative* of the section u_t.

Lemma 2.2. *Two forms, $\tilde{u}$ and $\tilde{u}'$, on $\mathcal{X}$ have the same restriction to the fiber X_t, i e represent the same section u_t, if and only if*

$$(\tilde{u} - \tilde{u}') \wedge dt \wedge d\bar{t} = 0,$$

on X_t, where $dt = dt_1 \wedge ...dt_m$ for some choice of local coordinates on the base. This holds if and only if

$$\tilde{u}' = \tilde{u} + \sum_1^m a_j \wedge dt_j + \sum_1^m b_j \wedge d\bar{t}_j$$

for some $(n-1)$-forms a_j and b_j on $\mathcal{X}$.

Proof. Both statements follow by choosing local coordinates (t, z) as above. □

Notice that the forms a_j and b_j are not uniquely determined, but their restriction to the fibers are uniquely determined. This follows since if

$$\sum a_j \wedge dt_j + \sum b_j \wedge d\bar{t}_j = 0,$$

e g wedging with $\widehat{dt_j} \wedge d\bar{t}$, we get

$$a_j \wedge dt \wedge d\bar{t} = 0,$$

which means that a_j vanishes on fibers by the lemma.

We will mainly be interested in the case when u_t are $\bar{\partial}$-closed of a fixed bidegree (p, q) and in their cohomology classes $[u_t]$ in $H^{p,q}(L_t)$. By Hodge theory, each such class has a unique harmonic representative for the $\bar{\partial}$-Laplacian $\Box''$ defined by the fiber metric ϕ (restricted to X_t) and the Kähler form ω_t. Since $\Box'' = \bar{\partial}\bar{\partial}^* + \bar{\partial}^*\bar{\partial}$ and X_t is compact, a form u is harmonic if and only if $\bar{\partial}u = 0$ and $\bar{\partial}^*u = 0$. In the next lemma we give an alternative characterization of harmonic forms that will be useful in our computations.

Lemma 2.3. *Let X be an n-dimensional compact complex manifold and $L \to X$ a holomorphic line bundle with a negatively curved metric ϕ, i e $\omega := -i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi > 0$ on X. Let u be a (p, q)-form on X with values in L, where $p + q = n$. Then u is harmonic for the Kähler metric ω on X and the metric ϕ on L if and only if $\bar{\partial}u = 0$ and $\partial^\phi u = 0$, where $\partial^\phi = e^\phi \partial e^{-\phi}$ is the $(1, 0)$-part of the connection on L induced by the metric ϕ. Moreover, a harmonic (p, q)-form with $p + q = n$ is primitive, i e satisfies $\omega \wedge u = 0$.*

Proof. Let $\Box' = \partial^\phi(\partial^\phi)^* + (\partial^\phi)^*\partial^\phi$ be the $(1, 0)$-Laplacian. By the Kodaira-Nakano formula

$$\Box'' = \Box' + [i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi, \Lambda_\omega].$$

Since $i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi = -\omega$ and the commutator $[\omega, \Lambda_\omega] = 0$ on n-forms, we see that $\Box' = \Box''$ on n-forms. Hence, $\partial^\phi u = 0$ if u is harmonic, which proves one direction in the lemma. We also have, when $\bar{\partial}u = \partial^\phi u = 0$, that $\bar{\partial}\partial^\phi u + \partial^\phi \bar{\partial}u = 0$, which gives that $\omega \wedge u = 0$, so u is primitive.

Then $*u = cu$, where $c \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|c| = 1$, so when $\partial^\phi u = 0$, $\bar{\partial}^* u = - * \partial^\phi * u = 0$. Hence $\Box'' u = 0$ if $\bar{\partial}u = 0$ and $\partial^\phi u = 0$, which proves the converse direction of the lemma. □

A similar result of course holds (with the same proof) in case L is positive and we use $\omega = i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi$ as our Kähler metric.

At this point we also insert an estimate that will be useful later when we simplify the curvature formula. It generalizes a formula in [4] (see section 4 in that paper).

Proposition 2.4. *With notation and assumptions as in Lemma 2.3, let g be an L-valued form of bidegree (p, q) and f an L-valued form of bidegree $(p + 1, q - 1)$, where $p + q = n$. Assume*

$$\partial^\phi g = \bar{\partial} f$$

and that $f \perp Range(\bar{\partial})$ and $g \perp Ker(\partial^\phi)$. Then

$$\|f\|^2 - \|g\|^2 = \langle (\Box'' + 1)^{-1} f, f \rangle.$$

Moreover, $g \in R(\Box'' - 1)$ and

$$\|f\|^2 - \|g\|^2 = \langle (\Box'' - 1)^{-1} g, g \rangle.$$

Proof. Since g is orthogonal to the space of harmonic forms, g lies in the domain of $(\Box'')^{-1}$. Since the spectrum of $\Box''$ is discrete, g does also lie in the domain of $(\Box''-\lambda)^{-1}$ for λ sufficiently small and positive. We have

$$\lambda\langle(\Box''-\lambda)^{-1}g,g\rangle+\|g\|^2=\langle\Box''(\Box''-\lambda)^{-1}g,g\rangle=$$

$$\langle\Box'(\Box'-\lambda)^{-1}g,g\rangle=\langle(\Box'-\lambda)^{-1}\partial^\phi g,\partial^\phi g\rangle=\langle(\Box'-\lambda)^{-1}\bar\partial f,\bar\partial f\rangle.$$

Here we have used in the first equality on the second line that $\Box'=\partial^\phi(\partial^\phi)^*+(\partial^\phi)^*\partial^\phi$ and g is orthogonal to $R(\partial^\phi)$. Since $\Box'=\Box''+1$ on forms of degree $(n+1)$, this equals

$$\langle\bar\partial^*\bar\partial(\Box''+1-\lambda)^{-1}f,f\rangle=\langle\Box''(\Box''+1-\lambda)^{-1}f,f\rangle,$$

where the last equality follows since f is orthogonal to $R(\bar\partial)$. Clearly this expression stays bounded as λ increases to 1, so the expansion of g in eigenforms of $\Box''$ can not have any terms corresponding to eigenvalues less than or equal to 1. Hence g lies in the domain of $(\Box''-\lambda)^{-1}$ for all $0\le\lambda\le 1$ and

$$\lambda\langle(\Box''-\lambda)^{-1}g,g\rangle+\|g\|^2=\langle\Box''(\Box''+1-\lambda)^{-1}f,f\rangle.$$

Putting $\lambda=1$ we get

$$\|g\|^2+\langle(\Box''-1)^{-1}g,g\rangle=\|f\|^2,$$

and putting $\lambda=0$ we get

$$\|g\|^2=\langle\Box''(\Box''+1)^{-1}f,f\rangle=\|f\|^2-\langle(\Box''+1)^{-1}f,f\rangle.$$

□

Note that in the case of positive curvature, when $i\partial\bar\partial\phi=\omega$, we get with the same proof that

$$\|g\|^2-\|f\|^2=\langle(\Box''+1)^{-1}g,g\rangle,$$

when $\bar\partial f=\partial^\phi g$, g is orthogonal to the range of ∂^ϕ and f is orthogonal to the kernel of $\bar\partial$.

The next lemma gives in particular a simple way to compute norms of harmonic forms.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $c_n=(i)^{n^2}$. If u is a primitive (p,q)-form, with $p+q=n$ on an n-dimensional Kähler manifold (X,ω),*

$$(-1)^q c_n u\wedge\bar u=|u|^2_\omega\omega^n/n!.$$

The proof can be found in [11].

This means that the L^2-norms of primitive forms u_t over a fiber X_t can be expressed in terms of the fiberwise integrals of $u_t\wedge\bar u_t$. When we differentiate such integrals with respect to t it is convenient to express them as pushforwards.

Lemma 2.6. *If u_t is a smooth section of primitive (p,q)-forms on X_t, where $p+q=n$, we have*

$$\int_{X_t}|u_t|^2_{\omega_t}\omega_t^n/n!\,e^{-\phi}=(-1)^q c_n p_*(\tilde u\wedge\overline{\tilde u}e^{-\phi}),$$

if $\tilde u$ is any representative of u_t.

We will also need (follows from the Fundamental theorem of Kodaira-Spencer in [17])

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{X} \to B$ be a smooth proper fibration, and $L \to \mathcal{X}$ a holomorphic line bundle. Assume that the dimension of $H^{p,q}(L_t)$ is a constant. Let $t \to u_t$ be a smooth section of (p,q)-forms, $\bar\partial$-closed on X_t, and let $u_{t,h}$ be the harmonic representatives of the classes $[u_t]$ in $H^{p,q}(L_t)$. Then $t \to u_{t,h}$ is smooth.*

In the computations below we will frequently use the *interior multiplication* of a form with a vector (field), defined as the adjoint of exterior multiplication under the natural duality between forms and the exterior algebra of tangent vectors. If V is a vector and θ is a form, it is denoted as $V\rfloor\theta$. Interior multiplication is an antiderivation, so $V\rfloor(a\wedge b) = (V\rfloor a)\wedge b + (-1)^{deg(a)}a\wedge(V\rfloor b)$. More generally, we can take the interior product of a wedge product of vectors with a form, and it holds that

$$(V_1 \wedge ...V_k)\rfloor\theta = V_1\rfloor...(V_k\rfloor\theta).$$

3. The bundles $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$

We will now consider the vector bundles $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ over the base B whose fibers are $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}_t := H^{p,q}(L_t)$. A smooth section of this bundle can be written as $t \to [u_t]$ such that $t \to u_{t,h}$ (see Lemma 2.7) is a smooth section of the bundle of (p,q)-forms on X_t as in Lemma 1.1 (when we write $[u_t]$ it always means that u_t is $\bar\partial$-closed on X_t). We will first give a way to express the $(0,1)$-part of the connection on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$.

For this we let $\tilde u$ be any representative of the section $[u_t]$, i e a (p,q)-form on $\mathcal{X}$ whose restriction to each X_t cohomologous to u_t. Since $\bar\partial\tilde u = 0$ on fibers, Lemma 1.2 shows that

$$\bar\partial\tilde u = \sum_1^m dt_j\wedge\eta_j + \sum_1^m d\bar t_j\wedge\nu_j,$$

for some forms η_j and ν_j. We now define

$$D''[u_t] = \sum [\nu_j|_{X_t}]\otimes d\bar t_j.$$

For this to make sense we have to check that it does not depend on the various choices made. First, if $\tilde u'$ is smooth and restricts to each X_t to a form u'_t cohomologous to u_t, we can write $u'_t = u_t + \bar\partial v_t$, where v_t can be taken to depend smoothly on t. Then, if $\tilde v$ is a representative of v_t then $\tilde u' - \bar\partial\tilde v$ is a representative of u_t. We therefore only have to check that the definition does not depend on the choice of representatives in the sense of Lemma 2.1. But if we change a representative $\tilde u$ by adding $\sum a_j\wedge dt_j + \sum b_j\wedge d\bar t_j$, ν_j changes only by the $\bar\partial$-exact term $\bar\partial b_j$ so the cohomology class $[\nu_j|_{X_t}]$ does not change. Thus, the definition of $D''[u_t]$ does not depend on the choice of representative of the section u_t nor on the choice of representative in the cohomology class.

We next equip $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ with the hermitian metric

$$\|[u_t]\|^2_t = \int_{X_t} |u_{t,h}|^2_\omega e^{-\phi}\omega^n/n!$$

(where we have written ω instead of ω_t), where $u_{t,h}$ is the harmonic representative of $[u_t]$. By Lemmas 2.3 and 2.5, this equals

$$(-1)^q c_n \int_{X_t} u_{t,h} \wedge \bar{u}_{t,h} e^{-\phi},$$

which by Lemma 2.6 also can be written as

$$\|[u_t]\|_t^2 = (-1)^q c_n p_*(\tilde{u} \wedge \overline{\tilde{u}} e^{-\phi}), \tag{3.1}$$

for any choice of representative of the smooth section $u_{t,h}$.

Let now $\tilde{u}$ be any representative of a smooth section u_t such that each u_t is harmonic on X_t. By Lemma 2.3, this means that $\bar{\partial} u_t = 0$ on X_t and $\partial^\phi u_t = 0$ on X_t. We then have that

$$\partial^\phi \tilde{u} = \sum dt_j \wedge \mu_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \wedge \xi_j,$$

by Lemma 2.2, since the left hand side vanishes on fibers. We thus have two sets of equations for $\tilde{u}$,

$$\bar{\partial} \tilde{u} = \sum_1^m dt_j \wedge \eta_j + \sum_1^m d\bar{t}_j \wedge \nu_j, \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\partial^\phi \tilde{u} = \sum dt_j \wedge \mu_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \wedge \xi_j. \tag{3.3}$$

Taking $\bar{\partial}$ of the first equation and wedging with appropriate forms on the base, we see that η_j and ν_j are $\bar{\partial}$-closed on fibers, and taking ∂^ϕ of the second we see that μ_j and ξ_j are ∂^ϕ-closed. We stress that the forms η_j etc, and even their restrictions to fibers, depend on the choice of representative $\tilde{u}$, but the cohomology classes they define do not.

We now polarize (3.1) and use it to compute

$$\bar{\partial} \langle u_t, v_t \rangle_t = (-1)^q c_n \left(\sum p_*(d\bar{t}_j \wedge \nu_j \wedge \overline{\tilde{v}} e^{-\phi}) + \sum (-1)^n p_*(\tilde{u} \wedge \overline{dt_j \wedge \mu_j} e^{-\phi}) \right)$$

(the η_j:s and the ξ_j:s give no contrbution for bidegree reasons).

From this we see that $\sum [\mu_j] \otimes dt_j = D'[u_t]$, so we now also have an expression for the $(1,0)$-part of the connection on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ in terms of representatives.

To compute the curvature of the connection $D = D' + D''$ we will compute $i\partial\bar{\partial}\|u_t\|_t^2$ and use the classical formula

$$-\langle \Theta^E_{W,\bar{W}} u_t, u_t \rangle_t + \|D'_W u_t\|_t^2 = i\partial\bar{\partial}\|u_t\|_t^2(W, \bar{W}),$$

valid for any holomorphic section of a hermitian vector bundle E and any $(1,0)$ vector in the base. Here it will be convenient to choose our representatives in a special way, so we first discuss this issue in the next sections.

4. The horizontal lift.

Recall that we assume that $\Omega = -i\partial\bar\partial\phi$ is strictly positive on fibers. In this situation we can, following Schumacher, [30], define the *horizontal lift* of a vector field on the base. This represents a variation of the notion of *harmonic lift*, introduced by Siu in [31].

Proposition 4.1. *Let W be a $(1,0)$ vector field on the base B. If $\Omega > 0$ on fibers, there is a unique vector field $V = V_W$ on $\mathcal{X}$ such that*

$$dp(V) = W \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\Omega(V, \bar U) = 0, \tag{4.2}$$

for any field U on $\mathcal{X}$ that is vertical, i e satisfies $dp(U) = 0$. V is called the horizontal lift of W.

Proof. We begin with uniqueness. Assume V and V' both satisfy (4.1) and (4.2). Then $V - V'$ is vertical, so

$$\Omega(V - V', \overline{V - V'}) = \Omega(V, \overline{V - V'}) - \Omega(V', \overline{V - V'}) = 0.$$

Since we have assumed that Ω is strictly positive on fibers, $V - V' = 0$.

For the existence we note that the proposition is a purely pointwise, linear algebra statement. Given an arbitrary lift V' at a point x in $\mathcal{X}$, a general lift can be written $V = V' + U$, where U is vertical. We therefore have n equations for n unknowns, so uniqueness implies existence. □

Expressed differently, the condition (4.2) means that

$$V \rfloor \Omega(\bar U) = 0$$

for all vertical U, so

$$V_W \rfloor \Omega = \sum b_j d\bar t_j =: b, \tag{4.3}$$

for some functions b_j if t_j are local coordinates on the base. Clearly b depends linearlily on W, so if $W = \sum W_j \partial/\partial t_j$,

$$V_W \rfloor \Omega = i \sum c_{j,k}(\Omega) W_j d\bar t_k = V_W \rfloor C(\Omega),$$

where

$$C(\Omega) = i \sum c_{j,k}(\Omega) dt_j \wedge d\bar t_k.$$

(Here we have also used that $V_W \rfloor dt_j = W_j$.) We say that a $(1,0)$ vector (field) on $\mathcal{X}$ is horizontal if it is the horizontal lift of some vector (field) on the base. The dimension of the space of horizontal vectors at a point is the dimension of the base, and the intersection between the horizontal vectors and the vertical vectors is just the zero vector. Hence any vector at a point in $\mathcal{X}$ has a unique decomposition as a sum of a vertical and a horizontal vector. Similarily, a $(0,1)$ vector (field) V is horizontal respectively vertical if $\bar V$ is horizontal or vertical. We next introduce the corresponding notions for forms.

Definition 1. A form θ is *horizontal* if $U\rfloor\theta = 0$ for any vertical U, and θ is *vertical* if $V\rfloor\theta = 0$ for any horizontal vector (field) V.

To make this a little bit more concrete, let V_j be the horizontal lift of $\partial/\partial t_j$, where t_j are local coordinates on the base for $j = 1, ...m$. Let W_k for $k = 1, ...n$ be a system of vertical $(1,0)$-fields such that V_j and W_k together form a basis for the space of $(1,0)$ vectors near a given point x in $\mathcal{X}$. Then we may find local coordinates (s, z) near x such that $W_k = \partial/\partial z_k$ for $k = 1, ...n$ and $V_j = \partial/\partial s_j$ for $j = 1, ...m$ at x. (Then, still at x, $ds_j(V_k) = \delta_{jk}$ and $ds_j(W_k) = 0$, from which it follows that $ds_j = p^*(dt_j)(= dt_j)$.) Then $V_j\rfloor dz_k = 0$ so all dz_k are vertical forms, and similarily $W_k\rfloor ds_j = 0$, so $dt_j = ds_j$ are horizontal (which is easy to see directly). Therefore the horizontal forms are of the type

$$\sum a_{J,K} dt_J \wedge d\bar{t}_K,$$

and vertical forms are of the type

$$\sum b_{J,K} dz_J \wedge d\bar{z}_K.$$

In this terminology, $C(\Omega)$ is horizontal, and the relation $V_W\rfloor\Omega = V_W\rfloor C(\Omega)$ implies that $\Omega - C(\Omega)$ is vertical.

Next, let $V_1, V_2, ...$ be the horizontal lifts of $\partial/\partial t_1, \partial/\partial t_2, ..$, where t_j are local coordinates on the base. Let $\mathcal{V} = V_m \wedge ...V_1$ and put for an arbitrary form θ on $\mathcal{X}$,

$$P_v(\theta) = (\bar{\mathcal{V}} \wedge \mathcal{V})\rfloor(dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \theta). \tag{4.4}$$

Clearly, $P_v(\theta)$ is always vertical and does not depend on the choice of local coordinates. Moreover, if θ is already vertical, then $P_v(\theta) = \theta$, so P_v is a projection from the space of all forms on $\mathcal{X}$ to the space of vertical forms.

Proposition 4.2. *If θ is an arbitrary form on $\mathcal{X}$, $P_v(\theta) - \theta$ vanishes on fibers. If a vertical form vanishes on fibers it vanishes identically.*

Proof. The first statement means that

$$P_v(\theta) \wedge dt \wedge d\bar{t} = \theta \wedge dt \wedge d\bar{t}.$$

This follows from the definition of P_v if we use that contraction is an antiderivation and $(\bar{\mathcal{V}} \wedge \mathcal{V})\rfloor(dt \wedge d\bar{t}) = 1$.

For the second statement we use that if θ is vertical, $P_v(\theta) = \theta$. On the other hand, $P_v(\theta) = 0$ if θ vanishes on fibers, since $dt \wedge d\bar{t} \wedge \theta = 0$ then. □

If the base dimension $m = 1$, $C(\Omega) = c(\Omega) i dt \wedge d\bar{t}$.

Proposition 4.3. *If $m = 1$,*

$$C(\Omega) \wedge \Omega^n/n! = \Omega^{n+1}/(n+1)!,\ c(\Omega) = \frac{\Omega^{n+1}/(n+1)!}{\Omega^n/n! \wedge i dt \wedge d\bar{t}}.$$

Proof. We prove this assuming $\Omega > 0$ (the general case follows by considering $\Omega + \lambda i dt \wedge d\bar{t}$ for λ large). Then $V\rfloor\Omega = a d\bar{t}$ means that

$$-i\Omega(V, \bar{W}) = -ia d\bar{t}(\bar{W})$$

for any $(1,0)$-vectors W. This means that V and $ad\bar{t}$ are dual under the conjugate linear isomorphism between $(1,0)$ vectors and $(0,1)$-forms induced by the scalar product $-i\Omega(V,\bar{W})$. Hence

$$-i\Omega(V,\bar{V}) = |a|^2|dt|^2_\Omega.$$

But $\Omega(V,\bar{V}) = ad\bar{t}(\bar{V}) = a$, so

$$a = i/|dt|^2_\Omega = ic(\Omega).$$

□

5. Good representatives

Let u_t be a section of the bundle of smooth n-forms on the fibers. Recall that this means that for each t in the base, u_t is an n-form on the fiber X_t, and there is a smooth n-form $\tilde{u}$ on the total space $\mathcal{X}$ (a representative of u_t) which restricts to u_t on each X_t.

Proposition 5.1. *Any smooth section u_t has a unique vertical representative.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{u}$ be an arbitrary representative and let $\hat{u} := P_v(\tilde{u})$. Then Proposition 4.2 implies that $\hat{u}$ is also a representative of u_t (since $\hat{u} - \tilde{u}$ vanishes on fibers), and $\hat{u}$ is by definition vertical. Uniqueness also follows from Proposition 4.2. □

We now assume also that u_t is primitive on each fiber, or equivalently that

$$\Omega \wedge \tilde{u} \wedge dt \wedge d\bar{t} = 0$$

if $dt = dt_1 \wedge ..dt_m$ for a system of local coordinates on the base.

Definition 2. We say that $\hat{u}$ is a *good* representative for the section u_t if $\hat{u}$ is a smooth n-form on $\mathcal{X}$ that restricts to u_t on fibers and satisfies

$$\Omega \wedge \hat{u} \wedge dt = \Omega \wedge \hat{u} \wedge d\bar{t} = 0.$$

Proposition 5.2. *If $\hat{u}$ is a vertical representative of a section that is primitive on fibers, then*

$$\Omega \wedge \hat{u} = C(\Omega) \wedge \hat{u}.$$

Proof. The form

$$\theta := (\Omega - C(\Omega)) \wedge \hat{u}$$

is a product of vertical forms, hence vertical. Since $C(\Omega)$ vanishes on fibers and $\hat{u}$ is primitive on fibers, θ vanishes on fibers. Hence $\theta = 0$ by Proposition 4.2. □

The next proposition implies in particular that any section u_t which is primitive on fibers has a good representative.

Proposition 5.3. *If $\hat{u}$ is a vertical representative of a section that is primitive on fibers, then $\hat{u}$ is a good representative.*

Proof. This is clear by the previous proposition since $C(\Omega) \wedge dt = C(\Omega) \wedge d\bar{t} = 0$. □

The final properties of good representatives that we need are summarized in the next proposition.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $\tilde{u}$ be a good representative of a section u_t that satisfies the equation*

$$(\bar{\partial} + \partial^{\phi})u_t = 0$$

on each fiber X_t. Let $\mathcal{D} := (\bar{\partial} + \partial^{\phi})$ on the total space $\mathcal{X}$. Then

$$\mathcal{D}\tilde{u} = \sum a_j \wedge dt_j + \sum b_j \wedge d\bar{t}_j,$$

where a_j and b_j are primitive and satisfy $(\bar{\partial} + \partial^{\phi})a_j = (\bar{\partial} + \partial^{\phi})b_j = 0$ on fibers.

Proof. Since $(\bar{\partial} + \partial^{\phi})\tilde{u}$ vanishes on fibers,

$$\mathcal{D}\tilde{u} = \sum a_j \wedge dt_j + \sum b_j \wedge d\bar{t}_j,$$

for some n-forms a_j and b_j. Since $\mathcal{D}^2 = \Omega\wedge$ we get

$$\Omega \wedge \tilde{u} = \sum \mathcal{D}a_j \wedge dt_j + \sum \mathcal{D}b_j \wedge d\bar{t}_j.$$

Wedging with $\widehat{dt_j} \wedge d\bar{t}$ we find that the restriction of $\mathcal{D}a_j$ to fibers vanishes (here we use that $\tilde{u}$ is good), and similarily we find that $\mathcal{D}b_j$ vanishes on fibers. Hence $\mathcal{D}^2 a_j = \mathcal{D}^2 b_j$ also vanish when restricted to fibers, which gives that a_j and b_j are primitive. □

Notice the particular case when u_t has pure bidegree (p, q). Then the assumption means that $\bar{\partial}\tilde{u} = \partial^{\phi}\tilde{u} = 0$ on fibers, i. e. that u_t is harmonic on each fiber. The first conclusion is then that

$$\bar{\partial}\tilde{u} = \sum_1^m dt_j \wedge \eta_j + \sum_1^m d\bar{t}_j \wedge \nu_j, \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\partial^{\phi}\tilde{u} = \sum dt_j \wedge \mu_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \wedge \xi_j. \tag{5.2}$$

where all forms η_j, ν_j, μ_j and ξ_j are primitive. This follows from Proposition 5.4 since e g $(-1)^n a_j = \eta_j + \mu_j$ and η_j and μ_j have different bidegrees so each of them must be primitive.

We also get

$$\partial^{\phi}\eta_j = -\bar{\partial}\mu_j \tag{5.3}$$

and

$$\partial^{\phi}\nu_j = -\bar{\partial}\xi_j \tag{5.4}$$

from $(\bar{\partial} + \partial^{\phi})a_j = 0$ and $(\bar{\partial} + \partial^{\phi})b_j = 0$.

5.1. **Vertical representatives and the Kodaira-Spencer tensor.** We first recall the definition of the Kodaira-Spencer class. Let W be a holomorphic $(1, 0)$-vector field on B and let V be a smooth lift of W to $\mathcal{X}$ (so that $dp(V) = W$). In general, unless the fibration is locally trivial, we can not find a holomorphic lift, and the Kodaira-Spencer class is an obstruction to this. First we define

$$\kappa_V = \bar{\partial}V,$$

if V is any smooth lift of W. Then κ_V is a $(0, 1)$-form on $\mathcal{X}$ with coefficients in $T^{(1,0)}(\mathcal{X})$. Since $dp(V) = W$ is holomorphic, it actually takes values in the subbundle, F, of $T^{(1,0)}$ of vertical

vectors, i e vectors V' such that $dp(V') = 0$. Any other lift, say V', of W can be written $V + V''$ where V'' is vertical and

$$\kappa_{V'} = \kappa_V + \bar\partial V'',$$

so the cohomology class of κ_V in $H^{(0,1)}(\mathcal{X}, F)$ is well defined. We will call it $[\kappa_W]$. Similarily, we let $[\kappa_W^t]$ be the cohomology class of κ_V restricted to X_t.

In the sequel we will assume that the lift of W is taken as the horizontal lift. If $W = \partial/\partial t_j$ for a given system of coordinates on the base we will sometimes write V_j for the horizontal lift of $\partial/\partial t_j$ and just κ_j for κ_{V_j}. This depends of course on Ω, so it would be more proper to write $\kappa_j(\Omega)$, but we will use the lighter notation instead.

Locally, using local coordinates $x = (t, z)$ such that $p(x) = t$, κ_V can be written

$$\kappa_V = \sum_1^n Z_j \otimes d\bar z_j + \sum_1^m T_k \otimes d\bar t_k,$$

where Z_j and T_k are vector fields tangential to fibers. Its restriction to a fiber X_t is

$$\kappa_V^t = \sum_1^n Z_j \otimes d\bar z_j,$$

where we interpret z_j as local coordinates on X_t. If θ is a form on $\mathcal{X}$, κ_V operates on θ by letting the vector part of κ_V operate by contraction, followed by taking the wedge product with the form part. The result is called $\kappa_V \cup \theta$, which we sometimes write $\kappa_V.\theta$. In the same way, κ_V^t operates on forms on a fiber X_t. Notice that since the vector parts of the Kodaira-Spencer forms are vertical, the cup product commutes with restriction to fibers: $(\kappa_V \cup \theta)|_{X_t} = \kappa_V^t \cup (\theta|_{X_t})$.

Proposition 5.5. *Let u_t be a smooth section of (p, q)-forms such that u_t is harmonic on each fiber X_t. Let η_j and ξ_j be defined as in (5.1) and (5.2), where $\tilde u = \hat u$ is the vertical representative. Then, on each fiber*

$$\eta_j = \kappa_j^t \cup u_t$$

and

$$\xi_j = \overline{\kappa_j^t} \cup u_t.$$

Proof. In the proofs here we will use the easily verified formulas $\bar\partial(V\rfloor\theta) = (\bar\partial V).\theta - V\rfloor(\bar\partial\theta)$ and $\partial^\phi(\bar V\rfloor\theta) = (\partial\bar V).\theta - \bar V\rfloor(\partial^\phi\theta)$ for any form θ if V is of type $(1, 0)$. (Notice however that there are no similar formulas when V is of type $(0, 1)$.)

We have $V_j\rfloor\hat u = 0$, so taking $\bar\partial$ we get

$$(\bar\partial V_j).\hat u = V_j\rfloor\bar\partial\hat u = \eta_j + ...$$

where the dots indicate forms that contain dt_k or $d\bar t_j$ that therefore vanish when restricted to fibers. Restricting to fibers we then get (in view of the remarks above) that

$$\kappa_j^t \cup u_t = \eta_j.$$

For the second statement we use that $\bar V_j\rfloor\hat u = 0$ and take ∂^ϕ. Then

$$(\partial\bar V_j)\rfloor\hat u = \bar V_j\rfloor\partial^\phi\hat u = \xi_j + ...,$$

which gives that $\xi_j = \overline{\kappa_j^t} \cup \hat{u}$.

□

The final result in this section is a reflection of the familiar fact that the Kodaira-Spencer class defines a holomorphic section of the bundle with fibers $H^{0,1}(T^{1,0}(X_t))$.

Proposition 5.6. *Let $[u_t]$ be a holomorphic section of the bundle $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ (where $p+q=n$). Let W be a holomorphic vector field on B. Then*

$$[\kappa_W^t \cup u_t]$$

is a holomorphic section of $\mathcal{H}^{p-1,q+1}$.

Proof. It is enough to prove this when $W = \partial/\partial t_j$, so that $\kappa_j^t \cup u_t = \eta_j$ by Proposition 5.5. That u_t is holomorphic means that we can find some representative $\tilde{u}$ such that

$$\bar{\partial}\tilde{u} = \sum dt_j \wedge \eta_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \wedge \nu_j,$$

and each ν_j is zero on fibres, i.e. we can write

$$\nu_j = \sum dt_k \wedge a_j^k + \sum d\bar{t}_k \wedge b_j^k.$$

Taking $\bar{\partial}$ of $\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}$, we get that

$$0 = \sum dt_j \wedge \bar{\partial}\eta_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \wedge \bar{\partial}\nu_j.$$

Thus each $\bar{\partial}\eta_j$ is zero on fibres and we can write

$$\bar{\partial}\eta_j = \sum dt_k \wedge \eta_j^k + \sum d\bar{t}_k \wedge \nu_j^k.$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum dt_j \wedge dt_k \wedge \eta_j^k + \sum dt_j \wedge d\bar{t}_k \wedge \nu_j^k \\ &\quad + \sum dt_k \wedge d\bar{t}_j \wedge \bar{\partial}a_j^k + \sum d\bar{t}_k \wedge d\bar{t}_j \wedge \bar{\partial}b_j^k, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\nu_j^k = -\bar{\partial}a_k^j$ on fibres. Thus each ν_j^k are $\bar{\partial}$-exact on fibres and thus η_j defines a holomorphic section of $\mathcal{H}^{p-1,q+1}$. □

As an example of this we consider the case when $L = -K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ and $K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ is positive. Then $E^{n,0}$ has a canonical trivializing section, u_t^0, defined as follows. On any complex manifold X the bundle $K_X - K_X$ is of course trivial and has a canonical trivializing section defined locally as $s = dz \otimes (dz)^{-1}$. Applying this to each fiber X_t we get a trivializing section u_t^0 of the line bundle $E^{n,0}$. Wedging with the corresponding trivializing section of the base, which is locally $dt \otimes (dt)^{-1}$ we get an $(n+m,0)$-form, U^0 on $\mathcal{X}$ with values in $K_{X_t}^{-1} \otimes K_B^{-1} = K_X^{-1}$ (by the adjunction isomorphism). The form U^0 is easily seen to be the canonical trivializing section of $K_{\mathcal{X}} - K_{\mathcal{X}}$; in particular it is holomorphic. This means that $\bar{\partial}u^0 \wedge dt = 0$, so $\bar{\partial}u^0 = \sum dt_j \wedge \eta_j$, so u^0 is a holomorphic section of $E^{n,0}$.

Applying the proposition iteratively we get holomorphic sections of $E^{n-p,p}$ as

$$\kappa_{i_1}^t \cup ... \kappa_{i_p}^t \cup u_t^0$$

for any multi-index $I = (i_1, ...i_p)$.

6. The curvature formulas

We now have all the ingredients to begin computing the curvature of $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ with the L^2-metric. Let u_t be a smooth section of this bundle, which now means that $\bar{\partial} u_t = 0$ on X_t for each t and $\partial^\phi u_t = 0$ on X_t for each t. We take $\hat{u}$ to be a vertical representative of the section u_t so that

$$\bar{\partial}\hat{u} = \sum dt_j \wedge \eta_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \wedge \nu_j \tag{6.1}$$

and

$$\partial^\phi \hat{u} = \sum dt_j \wedge \mu_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \wedge \xi_j. \tag{6.2}$$

Then ν_j and μ_j have bidegree (p, q), η_j have bidegree $(p-1, q+1)$ and ξ_j have bidegree $(p+1, q-1)$ (forms of negative degree should be interpreted as zero). We decompose each of these forms on each fiber into one harmonic part and one part which is orthogonal to harmonic forms, so that e.g. $(\eta_j)_h$ is the harmonic part of η_j and $(\mu_j)_\perp$ is the part of μ_j which is orthogonal to harmonic forms.

Our main curvature formula is as follows.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $L \to \mathcal{X}$ be a line bundle with metric $e^{-\phi}$ where $i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi < 0$ on fibers and define the hermitian structure on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ using the Kähler forms $\omega_t = -i\partial\bar{\partial}\phi|_{X_t}$ on fibers. Then*

$$\langle \Theta_{\partial/\partial t_j, \partial/\partial \bar{t}_k} u_t, u_t \rangle_t =$$

$$-\langle (\Box''+1)^{-1}(\mu_j)_\perp, (\mu_k)_\perp \rangle_t - \langle (\Box''+1)^{-1}(\xi_k), (\xi_j) \rangle_t + \langle (\eta_j)_h, (\eta_k)_h \rangle_t - c_n(-1)^q \int_{X_t} c_{j,k}(\Omega) u_t \wedge \bar{u}_t e^{-\phi},$$

where μ, ξ, η are defined in formulas (5.1) and (5.2), using a vertical representative of u_t.

Recall that by Proposition 5.5, $\eta_j = \kappa_j \cup u_t$, and that $(\eta_j)_h$ is the harmonic representative of η_j. Similarily, $\xi_j = \overline{\kappa_j} \cup u_t$. As for the term containing μ_j, we can use the second part of Proposition 2.4 and write

$$\langle (\Box'' + 1)^{-1}(\mu_j)_\perp, (\mu_k)_\perp \rangle = \langle (\Box'' - 1)^{-1}(\eta_j)_\perp, (\eta_k)_\perp \rangle,$$

in this way we see that the whole formula for the curvature can be expressed in terms of u_t and κ.

Notice that all the terms in the curvature formula are negative, except the one coming from the harmonic part of η. This 'bad term' is clearly zero when $(p, q) = (0, n)$, for bidegree reasons. It also vanishes in case the harmonic part of κ vanishes, so that the fibration is isotrivial. More generally, if $W = \sum a_j \partial/\partial t_j$ is a vector at a point t in the base, and the cohomology class defined by $[\kappa_W] \cup u_t = 0$, then $\sum a_j (\eta_j)_h = 0$. Therefore we get that

$$\langle \Theta_{W,\bar{W}} u_t, u_t \rangle_t \leq 0.$$

In particular, if $\kappa_j \cup u_t = 0$ in cohomology for all j, then the full curvature operator acting on u_t is negative. This will play an important role in section 9.

In the proof of Theorem 6.1 we may assume that the base dimension m is equal to 1. Indeed, this means that the formula for the curvature form implicit in Theorem 6.1 holds when restricted

to any disk, and then it must hold on all of the base. We start from the classical fact that if u_t is a holomorphic section of an hermitian holomorphic vector bundle E, then

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t\partial\bar{t}}\|u_t\|_t^2 = -i\langle\Theta^E_{\partial/\partial t,\partial/\partial\bar{t}}u_t, u_t\rangle_t + \|D'_{\partial/\partial t}u_t\|_t^2. \tag{6.3}$$

Thus we need to compute $i\partial\bar{\partial}\|u_t\|_t^2$ when u_t is a holomorphic section and u_t is harmonic on fibers. We choose some representative $\tilde{u}$. By Lemma 2.6 we have

$$\|u_t\|_t^2 = (-1)^q c_n p_*(\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}).$$

Since the pushforward commutes with $\bar{\partial}$ we get

$$\bar{\partial}p_*(\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) = p_*(\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) + (-1)^n p_*(\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\partial^\phi\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}).$$

We claim that the first term vanishes. For this we use that $\bar{\partial}\tilde{u} = dt\wedge\eta + d\bar{t}\wedge\nu$. The term containing η gives no contribution for bidegree reasons. For the second term we use that ν is $\bar{\partial}$-exact on fibers, which gives that the fiber integral

$$\int_{X_t}\tilde{u}\wedge\bar{\nu}e^{-\phi} = 0$$

since $\tilde{u} = u_t$ on X_t is harmonic on X_t. Thus

$$\bar{\partial}p_*(\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) = (-1)^n p_*(\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\partial^\phi\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}).$$

Taking ∂ we find

$$\partial\bar{\partial}p_*(\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) = (-1)^n p_*(\partial^\phi\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\partial^\phi\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) + p_*(\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\bar{\partial}\partial^\phi\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) =: A + B.$$

For the first term we recall that

$$\partial^\phi\tilde{u} = dt\wedge\mu + d\bar{t}\wedge\xi.$$

Clearly the mixed terms containing $\mu\wedge dt\wedge\bar{\xi}\wedge dt$ vanish, so

$$A = [p_*(\mu\wedge\bar{\mu}e^{-\phi}) - p_*(\xi\wedge\bar{\xi}e^{-\phi})]dt\wedge d\bar{t}. \tag{6.4}$$

For the B-term we use $\bar{\partial}\partial^\phi = -\partial^\phi\bar{\partial} + \partial\bar{\partial}\phi$. Hence

$$B = -p_*(\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\partial^\phi\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) - p_*(\partial\bar{\partial}\phi\wedge\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}).$$

As we have seen

$$p_*(\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) = 0.$$

Taking $\bar{\partial}$ of this we get

$$p_*(\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) = (-1)^{n+1}p_*(\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\partial^\phi\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}),$$

so

$$B = -p_*(\partial\bar{\partial}\phi\wedge\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) + (-1)^n p_*(\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}).$$

Now we use that

$$\bar{\partial}\tilde{u} = dt\wedge\eta + d\bar{t}\wedge\nu.$$

As before, the mixed terms give no contribution so

$$(-1)^n p_*(\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}\wedge\overline{\bar{\partial}\tilde{u}}e^{-\phi}) = p_*(\eta\wedge\bar{\eta}e^{-\phi}) - p_*(\nu\wedge\bar{\nu}e^{-\phi}).$$

Putting all this together (and using that $\Omega = -i\partial\bar\partial\phi$) we finally get

$$i\partial\bar\partial\|u_t\|_t^2 =$$
$$(-1)^q c_n[p_*(\mu\wedge\bar\mu e^{-\phi}) - p_*(\xi\wedge\bar\xi e^{-\phi}) + p_*(\eta\wedge\bar\eta e^{-\phi}) - p_*(\nu\wedge\bar\nu e^{-\phi})]idt\wedge d\bar t +$$
$$(-1)^q c_n p_*(\Omega\wedge\tilde u\wedge\overline{\tilde u}e^{-\phi}).$$

Up to this point the formula holds for any choice of representative. Now we take $\tilde u = \hat u$ to be the vertical representative. Then, by Proposition 5.4 and the comments after it, all forms η, μ, ξ and ν are primitive so by Lemma 2.6 the pushforward terms can be expressed as norms. Since μ and ν are of bidegree (p,q) whereas ξ is $(p+1,q-1)$ and η is $(p-1,q+1)$ we get

$$i\partial\bar\partial\|u_t\|_t^2 = \left(\|\mu\|_t^2 + \|\xi\|_t^2 - \|\nu\|_t^2 - \|\eta\|_t^2 + c_n(-1)^q\int_{X_t} c(\Omega)u_t\wedge\bar u_t e^{-\phi}\right)idt\wedge d\bar t, \tag{6.5}$$

where we have also used Proposition 5.2 in the last term.

Here we decompose $\mu = \mu_h + \mu_\perp$, where μ_h is harmonic and $\mu_\perp$ is orthogonal to harmonic forms. Then $\mu_h = D'_{\partial/\partial t}u_t$, so comparing with the general curvature formula (6.1) we get

$$\langle\Theta_{\partial/\partial t,\partial/\partial\bar t}\,u_t, u_t\rangle_t = -\|\mu_\perp\|^2 - \|\xi\|_t^2 + \|\nu\|_t^2 + \|\eta\|_t^2 - c_n(-1)^q\int_{X_t} c(\Omega)u_t\wedge\bar u_t e^{-\phi}. \tag{6.6}$$

This formula contains two positive contributions to the curvature, one coming from the norm of ν and one coming from the norm of η. We shall now see that the first of these can be eliminated and the second can be improved by replacing η by its harmonic part.

For this we decompose the forms η, ξ and ν, as we did with μ, into one harmonic part and one part orthogonal to harmonic forms. Since ν is exact, $\nu = \nu_\perp$. We now use formulas (5.3) and (5.4), which clearly also holds for the non harmonic parts of η, ξ, μ and ν. By Proposition 2.4, we can now rewrite formula (6.6).

First we note that since $\bar\partial\eta_\perp = 0$ and $\bar\partial\nu_\perp = 0$, they are not only orthogonal to harmonic forms, but also to all of the kernel of ∂^ϕ. In the same way, $\mu_\perp$ and $\xi_\perp$ are orthogonal to the kernel of $\bar\partial$. Therefore we can apply Proposition 2.4 with $g = \eta_\perp$ and $f = -\mu_\perp$, and to $g = \nu_\perp$ and $f = -\xi_\perp$. Finally we use that

$$\langle(\Box'' + 1)^{-1}\xi_\perp, \xi_\perp\rangle_t + \|\xi_h\|^2 = \langle(\Box'' + 1)^{-1}\xi, \xi\rangle_t.$$

Inserting this in formula (6.6) we obtain Theorem 6.1.

We finally record the counterpart of Theorem 6.1 for positively curved bundles. This can be proved in the same way as Theorem 6.1 (using the analog of Proposition 2.4 for positively curved metrics as commented in section 2), or by Serre duality, using Theorem 6.1.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $L\to\mathcal{X}$ be a line bundle with metric $e^{-\phi}$ where $i\partial\bar\partial\phi > 0$ on fibers and define the hermitian structure on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ using the Kähler forms $\omega_t = i\partial\bar\partial\phi|_{X_t}$ on fibers. Then*

$$\langle\Theta_{\partial/\partial t_j,\partial/\partial\bar t_k}\,u_t, u_t\rangle_t =$$
$$\langle(\Box'' + 1)^{-1}\eta_j, \eta_k\rangle_t + \langle(\Box'' + 1)^{-1}\nu_k, \nu_j\rangle_t - \langle(\xi_k)_h, (\xi_j)_h\rangle_t + c_n(-1)^q\int_{X_t} c_{j,k}(\Omega)u_t\wedge\bar u_t e^{-\phi},$$

where μ, ξ, η are defined in formulas (5.1) and (5.2), using a vertical representative of u_t.

This formula generalizes Theorem 1.2 in [4], which deals with the case $p = n, q = 0$. Then $\xi = 0$ (since it is of bidegree $(p+1, q-1)$) and $\nu = 0$ since ν is of bidegree $(n, 0)$ and therefore must vanish identically if u_t is a holomorphic section. This corresponds to the simplest case of Theorem 6.1, when $(p, q) = (0, n)$. Then the only contribution with 'bad sign' in that theorem, coming from η_h, must vanish for bidegree reasons.

7. Special features of the Kähler-Einstein case

In case $L = -K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ and K_{X_t} is positive for each t, we can in particular choose as our metrics ω_{ϕ_t} the Kähler-Einstein metrics on each fiber. It was shown by Schumacher, [30], that then the potential ϕ can be chosen so that $-i\partial\bar\partial_{\mathcal{X}}\phi$ is (semi)positive on the total space. This follows from a fundamental differential identity, that was later generalized in [25] to cover also the case of twisted Kähler-Einstein metrics. We shall now show that the formalism developed in sections 4 and 5 can be used to prove these results, and then give some consequences for the curvature formulas. In this section we assume that the base is one-dimensional.

Let β be a $(1,1)$ cohomology class on $\mathcal{X}$ which contains a form that is strictly positive on each fiber. The main case to keep in mind is $\beta = c_1[K_{\mathcal{X}/B}]$, and more generally we think of β as $\beta = c_1[K_{\mathcal{X}/B}] + \alpha$. Let Ω be a smooth form in β whose restriction to each X_t is positive, and let V be the horizontal lift of $\partial/\partial t$ with respect to Ω. Let $\widehat{u^0}$ be the vertical representative of the trivialising section u^0 of $K_{\mathcal{X}/B} - K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ from the end of section 6. We can then write locally,

$$\Omega^n/n! \wedge dV_t = c_n \widehat{u^0} \wedge \overline{\widehat{u^0}} \wedge dV_t e^{-\psi}, \tag{7.1}$$

where $dV_t = idt\wedge d\bar t$ for some choice of local coordinates on the base, and $e^{-\psi}$ is a smooth metric on $-K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$. Let $\omega_t = \Omega|_{X_t}$, which by assumption is a Kähler form. Then, from (7.1) we have that $i\partial\bar\partial\psi|_{X_t} = Ric(\omega_t)$. Let θ be the $(1,1)$-form $\theta = \Omega + i\partial\bar\partial\psi$. If $\beta = c_1[K_{\mathcal{X}/B}]$ and $\theta = 0$, we have $Ric(\omega_t) = -\omega_t$ and ω_t defines a Kähler-Einstein metric on each fiber X_t. In general, when $\beta = c_1[K_{\mathcal{X}/B}] + \alpha$, ω_t defines a *twisted* Kähler-Einstein metric, $Ric(\omega_t) = -\omega_t + \theta|_{X_t}$.

With this notation, the general form of Schumacher's theorem from [25] is as follows. We will use the notation $\|V\|^2_\Omega = (-i)\Omega(V, \bar V)$ and $\|V\|^2_\theta = (-i)\theta(V, \bar V)$, even though these 'squared norms' are not necessarily positive.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $\theta = \Omega + i\partial\bar\partial\psi$. Then on each fiber X_t,*

$$-\Delta c(\Omega) + c(\Omega) = |\kappa_t|^2 + \|V\|^2_\theta,$$

where Δ is the Laplace operator (on functions) on X_t for the Kähler metric ω_t, defined by

$$\Delta f \Omega^n/n! = i\partial\bar\partial f \wedge \Omega^{n-1}/(n-1)!.$$

Here V is the horizontal lift of $\partial/\partial t$ with respect to Ω, $\kappa_t := (\bar\partial V)|_{X_t}$.

Proof. We first contract (7.1) with V and get

$$\Omega^n/n! \wedge id\bar t = c_n \widehat{u^0} \wedge \overline{\widehat{u^0}} \wedge id\bar t e^{-\psi} \tag{7.2}$$

since $\widehat{u^0}$ is vertical and $V \rfloor \Omega \wedge dV_t = 0$. Applying ∂ to both sides we get

$$0 = \partial^\psi \widehat{u^0} \wedge \overline{\widehat{u^0} \wedge dt}$$

since $\bar\partial\widehat{u^0}\wedge dt=0$. Hence $\partial^\psi\widehat{u^0}=0$. Write as before $\bar\partial\widehat{u^0}=\eta\wedge dt$; by Proposition 5.4 η is primitive (for Ω) on fibers. Notice that

$$(V\rfloor\bar\partial+\bar\partial V\rfloor)\widehat{u^0}=(-1)^n\eta,$$

on fibres, thus we have

$$|\kappa_t|^2_\Omega=|\kappa_t.u^0_t|^2_\Omega e^{-\psi}=|\eta|^2_\Omega e^{-\psi}.$$

Moreover we have from $\partial^\psi\widehat{u^0}=0$ that

$$\partial^\psi\eta\wedge dt=\partial\bar\partial\psi\wedge\widehat{u^0}. \tag{7.3}$$

Next we contract (7.2) with $\bar V$. Since $V\rfloor\Omega=ic(\Omega)d\bar t$, $\bar V\rfloor\Omega=-ic(\Omega)dt$. Hence we get

$$c(\Omega)\Omega^{n-1}/(n-1)!dt\wedge d\bar t+i\Omega^n/n!=ic_n\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}e^{-\psi}. \tag{7.4}$$

Multiplying by i and taking $\bar\partial$ we get

$$\bar\partial c(\Omega)\wedge\Omega^{n-1}/(n-1)!\wedge dV_t=-c_n\eta\wedge dt\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}e^{-\psi}$$

since $\partial^\psi\widehat{u^0}=0$. Taking $i\partial$ of both sides we have

$$\Delta c(\Omega)\Omega^n/n!\wedge dV_t=-ic_n\partial^\psi\eta\wedge dt\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}e^{-\psi}+(-1)^nic_n\eta\wedge dt\wedge\overline{\eta\wedge dt}\,e^{-\psi}=$$

$$-c_ni\partial\bar\partial\psi\wedge\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}\,e^{-\psi}-|\eta|^2\Omega^n/n!\wedge dV_t\,e^{-\psi}.$$

Since $\widehat{u^0}$ is vertical and

$$\partial\bar\partial\psi\wedge\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}\wedge dt=0,$$

we have that

$$(V\rfloor\partial\bar\partial\psi)\wedge\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}\wedge dt+\partial\bar\partial\psi\wedge\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}=0,$$

and

$$((\bar V\wedge V)\rfloor\partial\bar\partial\psi)\wedge\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}\wedge dt+(\bar V\rfloor\partial\bar\partial\psi)\wedge\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}=0,$$

thus

$$\partial\bar\partial\psi(V,\bar V)\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}\wedge dt=-(\bar V\rfloor\partial\bar\partial\psi)\wedge\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}.$$

By the same reason, we have

$$(\bar V\rfloor\partial\bar\partial\psi)\wedge\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}\wedge d\bar t+\partial\bar\partial\psi\wedge\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}=0,$$

thus

$$\partial\bar\partial\psi\wedge\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}=\partial\bar\partial\psi(V,\bar V)\widehat{u^0}\wedge\overline{\widehat{u^0}}\wedge dt\wedge d\bar t.$$

Since $i\partial\bar\partial\psi=\theta-\Omega$, $\partial\bar\partial\psi(V,\bar V)=\|V\|^2_\theta-\|V\|^2_\Omega$, and by Proposition 4.3, $\|V\|^2_\Omega=c(\Omega)$. This completes the proof. □

From Theorem 7.1 we get as in [30] the following corollary.

Corollary 7.2. *Assume that θ is semi-positive on the total space. Then $\Omega\geq 0$ on $\mathcal{X}$ and $\Omega>0$ if $\kappa_t\neq 0$.*

Proof. We first prove that $c(\Omega) \geq 0$. Fix one fiber X_t and a point on X_t where $c(\Omega)$ is minimal. There $\Delta c(\Omega) \geq 0$, so from the theorem $c(\Omega)$ is nonnegative at a minimum point, hence everywhere.

Next we assume that $\kappa_t \neq 0$. It then follows from [29] (see Theorem 6 in section 3, chapter 2 of [29]) that $c(\Omega) > 0$ on the fiber. In fact, since we already know $c(\Omega) \geq 0$, if, at some point z_0, $c(\Omega)(z_0) = 0$, z_0 must be a maximum point of $-c(\Omega)$. Since $(\triangle - 1)(-c(\Omega)) \geq 0$, the above mentioned theorem in [29] implies that $c(\Omega) \equiv 0$ on that fiber. From the differential identity we see that κ_t vanishes (and $\|V\|_\theta$ vanishes too). This contradiction proves the second claim. □

The following result of Schumacher is also very useful.

Theorem 7.3. *Assume that $\beta = K_{\mathcal{X}/B}$ and $\theta = 0$ so that ω_t is Kähler-Einstein on each fiber. Then $\kappa_t \cup u^0$ is harmonic on each X_t.*

Proof. By (7.3), $\partial^\psi \eta \wedge dV_t = i\partial\bar\partial\psi \wedge \widehat{u^0} \wedge d\bar t = \Omega \wedge \widehat{u^0} \wedge d\bar t$. Since $\widehat{u^0}$ is vertical, this vanishes, so $\partial^\psi \eta = 0$ on fibers. Since $\bar\partial \eta = 0$ on fibers (always), this means that η is harmonic on fibers. By Proposition 5.5 this means that $\kappa_t \cup u^0$ is harmonic on fibers. □

We now return to the curvature formula Theorem 6.1. We still assume that the base dimension is one, and focus on the case $q = 1$. We choose as our section $u^1 = \kappa_t \cup u^0$, which by the previous theorem is harmonic on fibers, and by Proposition 5.6 defines a holomorphic section of $\mathcal{H}^{n-1,1}$. Suppressing the subscripts, the curvature formula in Theorem 6.1 is then

$$\langle \Theta u^1, u^1\rangle = -\langle (\Box + 1)^{-1}\mu_\perp, \mu_\perp\rangle - \langle (\Box + 1)^{-1}\xi, \xi\rangle + \|\eta_h\|^2 - \int_{X_t} c(\Omega)|u^1|^2\omega_t^n/n!e^{-\phi}.$$

By Proposition 5.5, $\xi = \kappa_t^* \cup u^1 = |\kappa_t|^2 u^0$. We now use that

$$(-\Delta c(\Omega))u^0 = \Box(c(\Omega)u^0).$$

Theorem 7.1 then translates to

$$c(\Omega)u^0 = (\Box + 1)^{-1}(|\kappa_t|^2 u^0) = (\Box + 1)^{-1}\xi.$$

Hence

$$\langle (\Box + 1)^{-1}\xi, \xi\rangle = \langle c(\Omega)u^0, \xi\rangle = \langle c(\Omega)u^1, u^1\rangle, \tag{7.5}$$

so the curvature formula admits the simplification

$$\langle \Theta u^1, u^1\rangle = -\langle (\Box + 1)^{-1}\mu_\perp, \mu_\perp\rangle + \|\eta_h\|^2 - 2\int_{X_t} c(\Omega)|u^1|^2\omega_t^n/n!e^{-\phi}. \tag{7.6}$$

In this special situation, when $u^1 = \kappa_t \cup u^0$ and ω_t are Kähler-Einstein, the curvature formula can be rewritten in yet another way.

Proposition 7.4. *When $u^1 = \kappa_t \cup u^0$ and the metric is Kähler-Einstein, we have*

$$\|\xi_h\|^2 = \frac{\|u^1\|^4}{\|u^0\|^2}.$$

As a consequence

$$\int_{X_t} c(\Omega)|u^1|^2\omega_t^n/n!e^{-\phi} \geq \frac{\|u^1\|^4}{\|u^0\|^2}.$$

Proof. ξ_h is the harmonic part of ξ so it defines a section of $\mathcal{H}^{n,0}$. Since the fibers of this bundle are one dimensional we must have $\xi_h = au^0$. Then

$$a = \frac{\langle \xi, u^0\rangle}{\|u^0\|^2} = \frac{\langle |\kappa_t|^2 u^0, u^0\rangle}{\|u^0\|^2} = \frac{\|u^1\|^2}{\|u^0\|^2}.$$

The first part of the proposition follows from this. The second part follows from the first part together with (7.5). □

8. More general curvature formulas

In this section we recast the arguments which lead to Theorem 6.1 in a completely formal way, following [39]. Our main motivations are as follows. First, this approach shows clearly the origin of the several terms in Theorem 6.1. Second, this allows us to derive the expression of the curvature of higher direct images in a very general setting (e.g. L could be a vector bundle of arbitrary rank, the index $p+q$ is not necessarily equal to the fiber dimension).

The main idea (see [3] for the background) is to consider the bundle $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ as quotient of an infinite dimensional space via the exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{I}^{p,q} \to \mathcal{K}^{p,q} \to \mathcal{H}^{p,q} \to 0, \tag{8.1}$$

where

$$\mathcal{K}^{p,q} := \{A^{p,q}(L_t) \cap \ker \bar\partial\}_{t\in B},\ \mathcal{I}^{p,q} := \{A^{p,q}(L_t) \cap \mathrm{Im}\bar\partial\}_{t\in B}.$$

and for each t we denote by $A^{p,q}(L_t)$ the space of smooth L_t-valued (p,q)-forms on X_t. We shall also use the notation

$$\mathcal{A}^{p,q} := \{A^{p,q}(L_t)\}_{t\in B}.$$

If $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$ in (8.1) were a finite dimensional Hermitian vector bundle, then one could evaluate the curvature of $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ in the classical way, by the well-known formula for quotient vector bundles. Of course that is not the case here. Even worse, $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$ does not have a natural local trivialization (so that we cannot define a structure of vector bundle of infinite rank). Nevertheless, by the work of Kodaira-Spencer the space $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$ has quite a few important properties, which ultimately will allow us to derive the curvature of $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ very much like in the classical set-up.

The following assumptions are assumed to hold throughout the current section.

(1) The map $p : \mathcal{X} \to B$ is a proper holomorphic submersion, where $\mathcal{X}$ is a Kähler manifold. We fix a semi-positive $(1,1)$-form Ω on $\mathcal{X}$ which is a Kähler metric when restricted to the fibers of p. The base B is a complex manifold.
(2) (L, h_L) is an arbitrary holomorphic vector bundle on $\mathcal{X}$, h_L is a smooth metric on L (no curvature assumptions on (L, h_L) for the moment);
(3) The function $t \to \dim H^{p,q}(L_t)$ is locally constant over the base B.

In what follows we shall introduce the notion of *quasi-vector bundle* and its associated connection and curvature. This is a variant of the standard notion of vector bundle, which does not involve the assumption of local triviality, and it will be useful for us since $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$ admits such a structure.

8.1. **Quasi-vector bundles.** Following [20] we introduce first a space of smooth sections of the 'bundle' $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$. In our case this is done as follows.
A map

$$u : t \mapsto u_t \in A^{p,q}(L_t),$$

defines a smooth section of $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$ if there exists a smooth L-valued (p,q)-form $\tilde{u}$ on the total space $\mathcal{X}$ such that we have

$$\tilde{u}|_{\mathcal{X}_t} = u_t \tag{8.2}$$

for any $t \in B$. We call $\widetilde{u}$ a representative of the section u. We denote by $\Gamma(\mathcal{A}^{p,q})$ (resp. $\Gamma(\mathcal{K}^{p,q})$, $\Gamma(\mathcal{I}^{p,q})$) the space of smooth sections of $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$ (resp. $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$, $\mathcal{I}^{p,q}$) on B. It is clear that all of them are $C^\infty(B)$-modules.

Despite of its simplicity, the following property will be crucial for us.

Proposition 8.1. *The space of sections $\Gamma(\mathcal{A}^{p,q})$ and $\Gamma(\mathcal{I}^{p,q})$ satisfy the extension property: for every $t_0 \in B$ and every section u^0 of $A^{p,q}(L_{t_0})$ (resp. $A^{p,q}(L_{t_0}) \cap \mathrm{Im}\bar{\partial}$), there exists u in $\Gamma(\mathcal{A}^{p,q})$ (resp. $\Gamma(\mathcal{I}^{p,q})$) such that $u|_{X_{t_0}} = u^0$. Moreover, $\Gamma(\mathcal{I}^{p,q})$ satisfies the extension property as well (here the hypothesis (3) above is crucial).*

Proof. The first part of the statement above is true since both the fibration and the bundle L are trivial from C^∞ point of view (see [17]). In other words, $\{L_t\}_{t\in U}$ is C^∞-equivalent to $U \times L_{t_0}$ on $p^{-1}(U)$ for some small neighborhood U of t_0. Here we denote by L_t the restriction $L|_{\mathcal{X}_t}$.

For the second part of the proposition, if u^0 is $\bar{\partial}$-closed then we can write

$$u^0 = u^0_h + u^0_\perp,$$

where u^0_h is harmonic and $u^0_\perp$ is $\bar{\partial}$-exact. Since the fiber of $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ has constant dimension, by the fundamental theorem of Kodaira-Spencer in [17], we know that u^0_h extends to a smooth section of $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$. Thus u^0 extends to a smooth section of $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$. □

The previous proposition motivates the following notion.

Definition 3. [Quasi-vector bundle] Let $V := \{V_t\}_{t\in B}$ be a family of $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces over a base B. Let Γ be a $C^\infty(B)$-submodule of the space of all sections of V. We call Γ a smooth quasi-vector bundle structure on V if each vector of the fiber V_t extends to a section in Γ locally near t.

A few remarks are in order at this point.

Remark 1. Unlike in [20], we do not require the fibers V_t to be Banach spaces. The reason is that this is not verified in the context we intend to use this notion. As Proposition 8.1 shows, Kodaira-Spencer theory is the main ingredient allowing us to disregard such completeness requirements. □

Remark 2. The extension hypothesis in Definition 3 can be seen as a compatibility condition between Γ and V. More precisely, if we define

$$V_t' := \{u(t) : u \in \Gamma\},$$

then we have

$$V_t' = V_t,$$

for every $t \in B$, if V is a quasi vector bundle. □

Remark 3. Our Definition 3 generalizes the usual notion of vector bundle structure even in finite rank case. For instance, consider a family of vector space, say $\{V_t\}$, over the unit disc $\mathbb{D}$, such that $V_t = \mathbb{C}^m$ if $t \neq 0$ and $V_0 = \{0\}$. There is no vector bundle structure on $\{V_t\}$, but

$$\Gamma := \{f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}^m) : f(0) = 0\}, \tag{8.3}$$

defines a smooth quasi-vector bundle structure on $\{V_t\}$. □

Remark 4. By the above proposition, if the fiber of $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ has constant dimension then the space of all smooth representatives define a natural smooth vector bundle structure on $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$. □

The notion of connection of a quasi-vector bundle is completely analogue to the usual one.

Definition 4. Let Γ be a smooth vector bundle structure on V. A smooth connection D on (V, Γ) is a $\mathbb{C}$-linear map

$$D : \Gamma \to A^1(B) \otimes \Gamma \tag{8.4}$$

such that the Leibniz rule is satisfied

$$D(fu) = fD(u) + df \otimes u, \ \forall \ f \in C^\infty(B), \ u \in \Gamma. \tag{8.5}$$

The curvature $\Theta := D^2$ of D is a $C^\infty(B)$-module homomorphism

$$\Theta : \Gamma \to A^2(B) \otimes \Gamma. \tag{8.6}$$

As usual, the restriction of the form Θu to certain fiber $\mathcal{X}_t$ depends only on $u|_{\mathcal{X}_t}$. Our definition of *quasi-vector bundle* guarantees that the induced fiberwise map is defined everywhere.

Any connection D on a quasi-vector bundle splits $D := D' + D''$ in its $(1,0)$ and $(0,1)$-part, respectively. We say that D'' defines a *holomorphic quasi-vector bundle structure* on V if $D'' \circ D'' = 0$.

A smooth Hermitian structure h on (V, Γ) is given by a collection $h = \{h^t\}_{t \in B}$ of a Hermitian norms on V_t such that we have

$$h : \Gamma \times \Gamma \to C^\infty(B). \tag{8.7}$$

We introduce the notion of Chern connection associated to (V, Γ, h) as follows.

Definition 5. Let (V, Γ) be a quasi-vector bundle on B endowed with with a smooth Hermitian metric h. Let D be a connection on (V, Γ). Then D is called a Chern connection of (V, Γ, h) if the following hold.

(i) The $(0,1)$-part D'' of D defines a holomorphic structure on (V, Γ).

(ii) The connection D is compatible with h, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t^j}h(u,v) = h(D_{\partial/\partial t^j}u, v) + h(u, D_{\partial/\partial \bar{t}^j}v),\ \forall\ u, v \in \Gamma, \tag{8.8}$$

where $D_{\partial/\partial t^j}u := \partial/\partial t^j \rfloor Du$.

Remark 5. Let D_1 and D_2 be two connections such that they define the same holomorphic quasi-vector bundle. If they are Chern connections, then we have $D_1 = D_2$. In fact, by (8.8), we have

$$h((D_0 - D_1)_{\partial/\partial t^j}u, v) \equiv 0,\ \forall\ u, v \in \Gamma.$$

Take $v = (D_0 - D_1)_{\partial/\partial t^j}u$, we know that the $(1,0)$-part of D_0 is also equal to the $(1,0)$-part of D_1, thus they are equal.

However, even if we assume that there is a holomorphic quasi-vector bundle structure on V, it does not seem to follow that a Chern connection on (V, Γ, h) exists (unlike in the usual case). □

Assume that D is a Chern connection on (V, Γ, h). Its corresponding curvature $\Theta := D^2$ is called the Chern curvature of D. It is a $C^\infty(B)$-module homomorphism $\Gamma \to A^{1,1}(B) \otimes \Gamma$. We shall write

$$\Theta = \sum \Theta_{j\bar{k}} dt^j \wedge d\bar{t}^k, \tag{8.9}$$

locally, and call $\Theta_{j\bar{k}} : \Gamma \to \Gamma$ curvature operators.

8.2. **Quasi-vector bundle structure and Chern connection on $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$.** In this section, we shall use the horizontal lift of vector fields with respect to Ω to define a Chern connection on $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$.

We first indicate the construction of a holomorphic quasi-vector bundle structure on $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$. This depends heavily on the fact that the total space $\mathcal{X}$ is Kähler. In fact, it turns out that for every Kähler form ω on the total space $\mathcal{X}$, there exists an induced holomorphic quasi-vector bundle structure on $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$. This holomorphic structure depends on ω in general.

For each j, let V_j^ω be the horizontal lift of $\partial/\partial t^j$ with respect to ω. In case $p = q = 0$, one may identify $\Gamma(\mathcal{A}^{0,0})$ with the space of smooth sections of L. Then we can define a $(0,1)$-connection on $\Gamma(\mathcal{A}^{0,0})$ as follows

$$D''u := \sum d\bar{t}^j \otimes (\bar{V}_j^\omega \rfloor \bar{\partial} u).$$

Since each V_j^ω is horizontal with respect to a non-degenerate d-closed form, the proof of Proposition 8.2 below implies that $(D'')^2 = 0$. By definition D'' then defines a holomorphic quasi-vector bundle structure on $\Gamma(\mathcal{A}^{0,0})$. We show next that this construction can be generalized to all $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$.

Recall that we have a fixed Kähler metric Ω on $\mathcal{X}$. We denote by V_j the horizontal lift vector fields with respect to Ω.

Let $\hat{u}$ be the vertical representative of a smooth section $u : t \mapsto u_t$ of $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$. Then can write

$$\bar{\partial}\hat{u} = \hat{a} + \sum dt_j \wedge \eta_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \wedge \nu_j, \tag{8.10}$$

and

$$\partial^\phi \hat{u} = \hat{b} + \sum dt_j \wedge \mu_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \wedge \xi_j, \tag{8.11}$$

where $\hat{a} := P_v(\bar{\partial}\hat{u}),\ \hat{b} := P_v(\partial^\phi\hat{u})$, are vertical forms (see Proposition 4.2) and $\bar{\partial} + \partial^\phi$ denotes the Chern connection on (L, h_L).
The connection $D^{\mathcal{A}}$ on $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$ is defined by the formula

$$D^{\mathcal{A}}u = \sum dt_j \otimes \mu_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \otimes \nu_j. \tag{8.12}$$

Notice that μ and ν are defined from a vertical representative of our section and therefore depend on the choice of Kähler form. Also, we have the identities

$$\mu_j = [\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}]\hat{u},\ \nu_j = [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\hat{u},$$

on fibers, where

$$\delta_{V_j} := V_j\rfloor,\ \delta_{\bar{V}_j} = \bar{V}_j\rfloor,$$

are contractions by horizontal vector fields and

$$[\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}] := \partial^\phi\delta_{V_j} + \delta_{V_j}\partial^\phi,\ [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}] := \bar{\partial}\delta_{\bar{V}_j} + \delta_{\bar{V}_j}\bar{\partial}. \tag{8.13}$$

This is a consequence of the fact that $\delta_{V_j}\hat{u} = \delta_{\bar{V}_j}\hat{u} = 0$ when $\hat{u}$ is vertical.

The operators $[\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}]$ and $[\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]$ are called generalized Lie derivatives (see [21]). Thus we call $D^{\mathcal{A}}$ the *Lie-derivative connection* (see section 3 in [39]) on $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$. We now verify that the definition of $D^{\mathcal{A}}$ does not depends on the choice of representatives, i.e.

$$[\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}]\hat{u} = [\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}]\tilde{u},\ \ [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\hat{u} = [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\tilde{u}, \tag{8.14}$$

on fibers, where $\tilde{u}$ is an arbitrary representative of u. In fact, let us write

$$\hat{u} - \tilde{u} = \sum dt_j \wedge a_j + \sum d\bar{t}_j \wedge b_j.$$

In general, if f is a differential form and σ is an L-valued form then

$$[\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}](f \wedge \sigma) = ([\partial, \delta_{V_j}]f) \wedge \sigma + f \wedge [\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}]\sigma. \tag{8.15}$$

Thus $[\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}](\hat{u} - \tilde{u}) = 0$ on fibers. By the same proof, we also have $[\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}](\hat{u} - \tilde{u}) = 0$ on fibers, so the claim follows.

The next statement is an important step in what follows.

Proposition 8.2. *The Lie-derivative connection is a Chern connection on $(\mathcal{A}^{p,q}, h)$ provided that the Hermitian structure h is the usual L^2 norm*

$$\langle u, v\rangle(t) := \int_{X_t} \{u_t, \star v_t\}_{h_L},\ \forall\, u, v \in \Gamma(\mathcal{A}^{p,q}),$$

induced by Ω and h_L.

Proof. 1. The $(0,1)$-part of $D^{\mathcal{A}}$ is integrable. Let us write the $(0,1)$-part, say D'', of $D^{\mathcal{A}}$ as

$$D''u = \sum d\bar{t}_j \otimes [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\tilde{u}, \tag{8.16}$$

where $\tilde{u}$ is an arbitrary representative. Thus $(D'')^2u = 0$ if and only if $[[\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}], [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_k}]]\tilde{u} = 0$ on fibers. Notice that the usual Lie derivative identity $[[d, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}], [d, \delta_{\bar{V}_k}]] = [d, \delta_{[\bar{V}_j, \bar{V}_k]}]$ implies

$$[[\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}], [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_k}]] = [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{[\bar{V}_j, \bar{V}_k]}], \tag{8.17}$$

for bi-degree reason. Then it is enough to show

$$[\bar{V}_j, \bar{V}_k] \equiv 0. \tag{8.18}$$

In fact, since

$$[\bar{V}_j, \bar{V}_k]\rfloor\Omega = (L_{\bar{V}_j}\bar{V}_k)\rfloor\Omega = L_{\bar{V}_j}(\bar{V}_k\rfloor\Omega) - \bar{V}_k\rfloor L_{\bar{V}_j}\Omega, \tag{8.19}$$

$\bar{V}_k\rfloor\Omega = 0$ on fibers and

$$\bar{V}_k\rfloor L_{\bar{V}_j}\Omega = \bar{V}_k\rfloor[d, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\Omega = \bar{V}_k\rfloor d\left(\sum -ic_{l,j}(\Omega)dt_l\right) = 0,$$

on fibers, we know that $[\bar{V}_j, \bar{V}_k]\rfloor\Omega = 0$ fibers. Since $[\bar{V}_j, \bar{V}_k]$ are vertical vectors, we must have know $[\bar{V}_j, \bar{V}_k] \equiv 0$. Thus $(D'')^2 u \equiv 0$.

2. $D^{\mathcal{A}}$ preserves the metric. We need to show

$$\partial/\partial t^j \langle u, v\rangle = \langle [\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}]\tilde{u}, v\rangle + \langle u, [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\tilde{v}\rangle. \tag{8.20}$$

This is obvious with the set up in previous sections. (Recall that in the previous sections, u, v were primitive on fibers, so we could use Lemma 2.6 to prove the above identity). In order to prove the general case, we have to use the fiberwise primitive decomposition. Let us choose a representative, say $\tilde{v}$, of v such that

$$\tilde{v} = \sum \Omega_r \wedge v_r, \Omega_r := \Omega^r/r!, \tag{8.21}$$

where v_r are smooth L-valued $(p-r, q-r)$-forms that are primitive on fibers. Then we know that

$$\tilde{*}\tilde{v} := \sum C_r\, \Omega_{n+r-p-q} \wedge v_r,\ C_r := i^{(p+q)^2}(-1)^{p-r}, \tag{8.22}$$

will be a smooth representative of $t \mapsto v_t^*$. Thus

$$\partial/\partial t^j \langle u, v\rangle = p_*([d, \delta_{V_j}]\{\tilde{u}, \tilde{*}\tilde{v}\}),\ \{\tilde{u}, \tilde{*}\tilde{v}\} := u \wedge \overline{\tilde{*}\tilde{v}} e^{-\phi}. \tag{8.23}$$

For bidegree reason, we have $p_*([d, \delta_{V_j}]\{\tilde{u}, \tilde{*}\tilde{v}\}) = p_*([\partial, \delta_{V_j}]\{\tilde{u}, \tilde{*}\tilde{v}\})$. Notice that

$$[\partial, \delta_{V_j}]\{\tilde{u}, \tilde{*}\tilde{v}\} = \{[\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}]\tilde{u}, \tilde{*}\tilde{v}\} + \{\tilde{u}, [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\tilde{*}\tilde{v}\}.$$

Thus it suffices to show that

$$[\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\tilde{*}\tilde{v} = \tilde{*}[\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\tilde{v}, \tag{8.24}$$

on fibers. Since Ω is $\bar{\partial}$-closed and each V_j is horizontal, we know that the left hand side of (8.24) is equal to

$$\sum C_r\, \Omega_{n+r-p-q} \wedge [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]v_r,$$

on fibers. By the same reason, we also have

$$[\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\tilde{v} = \sum \Omega_r \wedge [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]v_r,$$

on fibers. Since a k-form, say σ, is primitive on fibers if and only if $k \leq n$ and $\Omega_{n-k+1} \wedge \sigma = 0$ on fibers, we know that each $[\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]v_r$ is primitive on fibers. Thus the right hand side of (8.24) is also equal to $\sum C_r\, \Omega_{n+r-p-q} \wedge [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]v_r$ on fibers. The proof is complete. □

We remark that the Hermitian vector space $(\mathcal{A}_t^{p,q}, h_t)$ is not complete. The following considerations show that for our future purposes this will not be a problem.

By the assumption (3) at the beginning of this section the function $t \to \dim H^{p,q}(L_t)$ is constant. As a consequence of the elliptic theory (cf. [17]) the orthogonal projections

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{A}^{p,q}) \to \Gamma(\mathcal{K}^{p,q}),\ \Gamma(\mathcal{K}^{p,q}) \to \Gamma(\mathcal{H}^{p,q}) \tag{8.25}$$

are well defined (i.e. the image of the maps above is contained in the space of smooth sections). Moreover, $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$ is a holomorphic quasi-subbundle of $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$. In fact, if $u \in \Gamma(\mathcal{K}^{p,q})$ then we have

$$\bar\partial[\bar\partial, \delta_{\bar V_j}]\tilde u = [\bar\partial, \delta_{\bar V_j}]\bar\partial\tilde u = 0$$

on fibers. This implies that each $D^{\mathcal{A}}_{\partial/\partial\bar t^j}u$ is a smooth section of $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$, which proves our assertion.

A similar argument shows that $\mathcal{I}^{p,q}$ is a holomorphic quasi-subbundle of $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$.

Remark 6. Therefore one may use $D^{\mathcal{A}}$ and the orthogonal projections (8.25) to define the induced Chern connection on the subbundle $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$ and the quotient bundle $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$. The argument in the beginning of section 3 implies that the $(0,1)$-part of the induced Chern connection on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ is canonical (i.e. independent of Ω). In fact, by a direct construction (see [38]), we know that the Chern connection on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ always exists (even when the total space is not Kähler). Moreover, the $(0,1)$-part of the Chern connection on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ is compatible with the coherent analytic sheaf structure on the direct images. □

8.3. **General curvature formulas.** Now we are ready to compute the curvature of $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$. Notice that the quotient norm of a class $[u_t]$ in $H^{p,q}(L_t)$ is equal to

$$\inf\{||u_t + v_t|| : v_t \in A^{p,q}(L_t) \cap \mathrm{Im}\bar\partial\} = ||u_{t,h}||,$$

where $u_{t,h}$ denotes the harmonic representative of $[u_t]$. Thus it will be more convenient to identify $[u_t]$ with $u_{t,h}$. Denote by $\Theta^{\mathcal{H}}_{j\bar k}$ and $\Theta^{\mathcal{K}}_{j\bar k}$ the Chern curvature operators on $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ and $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$ respectively. By the quotient bundle curvature formula, we have

$$\langle\Theta^{\mathcal{H}}_{j\bar k}u_h, u_h\rangle = \langle\Theta^{\mathcal{K}}_{j\bar k}u_h, u_h\rangle + \langle(D^{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial/\partial\bar t_k}u_h)_\perp, (D^{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial/\partial\bar t_j}u_h)_\perp\rangle, \tag{8.26}$$

where $D^{\mathcal{K}}$ denotes the induced Chern connection on our holomorphic subbundle $\mathcal{K}^{p,q}$ and

$$D^{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial/\partial\bar t_k}u_h := \partial/\partial\bar t_k \rfloor D^{\mathcal{K}}u_h = \partial/\partial\bar t_k \rfloor D^{\mathcal{A}}u_h = \nu_k.$$

As in the usual setting, the subbundle curvature formula holds and we have

$$\langle\Theta^{\mathcal{K}}_{j\bar k}u_h, u_h\rangle = \langle\Theta^{\mathcal{A}}_{j\bar k}u_h, u_h\rangle - \langle(D^{\mathcal{A}}_{\partial/\partial t_j}u_h)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}, (D^{\mathcal{A}}_{\partial/\partial t_k}u_h)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}\rangle, \tag{8.27}$$

where $(\cdot)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}$ denotes the $(\ker\bar\partial)^\perp$ part and

$$D^{\mathcal{A}}_{\partial/\partial t_j}u_h = \mu_j.$$

We have the following result.

Theorem 8.3. $\langle\Theta^{\mathcal{H}}_{j\bar k}u_h, u_h\rangle = \langle\Theta^{\mathcal{A}}_{j\bar k}u_h, u_h\rangle - \langle(\mu_j)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}, (\mu_k)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}\rangle + \langle(\nu_k)_\perp, (\nu_j)_\perp\rangle$.

Next we study the curvature of $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$. Define the operator

$$L_j = [\mathcal{D}, \delta_{V_j}],\ L_{\bar{k}} := [\mathcal{D}, \delta_{\bar{V}_k}],\ \mathcal{D} := \bar{\partial} + \partial^{\phi},$$

and then we have the following statement.

Lemma 8.4. *Let u be a smooth section of $\mathcal{A}^{p,q}$. Then we have*

$$\langle \Theta^{\mathcal{A}}_{j\bar{k}} u, u\rangle = \langle [L_j, L_{\bar{k}}]\tilde{u}, u\rangle + \langle \eta_j, \eta_k\rangle - \langle \xi_k, \xi_j\rangle,$$

where $\tilde{u}$ is an arbitrary representative of u and the Kodaira-Spencer terms η_j, ξ_k are defined in (8.10) *and* (8.11)*.*

Proof. By (8.10) and (8.11), we have

$$L_j\tilde{u} = D^{\mathcal{A}}_{\partial/\partial t_j} u + [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{V_j}]\tilde{u},\ L_{\bar{k}}\tilde{u} = D^{\mathcal{A}}_{\partial/\partial \bar{t}_k} u + [\partial^{\phi}, \delta_{\bar{V}_k}]\tilde{u}.$$

Thus the degree (p, q)-part of $[L_j, L_{\bar{k}}]\tilde{u}$ is equal to

$$\Theta^{\mathcal{A}}_{j\bar{k}} u + [[\bar{\partial}, \delta_{V_j}], [\partial^{\phi}, \delta_{\bar{V}_k}]]\tilde{u}.$$

Now it suffices to prove

$$\langle \xi_k, \xi_j\rangle = \langle [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{V_j}]\xi_k, \tilde{u}\rangle,\ \langle \eta_j, \eta_k\rangle = \langle [\partial^{\phi}, \delta_{\bar{V}_k}]\eta_j, \tilde{u}\rangle. \tag{8.28}$$

In fact, for bi-degree reason, we have $\langle \xi_k, \tilde{u}\rangle \equiv 0$. Thus the proof of Proposition 8.2 implies

$$0 \equiv \partial/\partial \bar{t}_j \langle \xi_k, \tilde{u}\rangle = \langle [\bar{\partial}, \delta_{V_j}]\xi_k, \tilde{u}\rangle - \langle \xi_k, \xi_j\rangle.$$

(notice that we have a minus sign in the above equality because $[\partial^{\phi}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\tilde{*}\tilde{u} = -\tilde{*}[\partial^{\phi}, \delta_{\bar{V}_j}]\tilde{u}$ on fibers). By the same reason, we also get $\langle \eta_j, \eta_k\rangle = \langle [\partial^{\phi}, \delta_{\bar{V}_k}]\eta_j, \tilde{u}\rangle$. The proof is complete. □

The commutation relation

$$[L_j, L_{\bar{k}}] = [\mathcal{D}, \delta_{[V_j, \bar{V}_k]}] + c_{j,k},\ c_{j,k} := \langle V_j, V_k\rangle_{\Theta(L, h_L)}.$$

is not too difficult to get (cf. Proposition 4.2 in [37] or simply the definition of curvature on principal bundle). By combining Theorem 8.4 and Lemma 8.4 we obtain our next reult (see Theorem 3.4 in [38] for a different approach).

Theorem 8.5. *With the notations above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Theta^{\mathcal{H}}_{j\bar{k}} u_h, u_h\rangle \ &= \ \langle [\mathcal{D}, \delta_{[V_j, \bar{V}_k]}]u_h, u_h\rangle + \langle c_{j,k} u_h, u_h\rangle + \langle \eta_j, \eta_k\rangle - \langle \xi_k, \xi_j\rangle \\ &\quad - \langle (\mu_j)_{\mathcal{K}^{\perp}}, (\mu_k)_{\mathcal{K}^{\perp}}\rangle + \langle (\nu_k)_{\perp}, (\nu_j)_{\perp}\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{8.29}$$

As promised, the expression of the curvature of $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ was derived here in very transparent manner. However, the drawback of working in this degree of generality is that the formula we obtain are not as explicit as in Theorem 6.1. Nevertheless, this result can be obtained as a corollary of 8.29 as we see next.

An alternative proof of Theorem 6.1. By our assumption $\Theta(L, h_L) = -\Omega$ in Theorem 6.1, we have $\mathcal{D}\tilde{u}_h = 0$ on fibers, thus the harmonic part of $([\mathcal{D}, \delta_{[V_j, \bar{V}_k]}]\tilde{u}_h)|_{X_t}$ vanishes, which implies

$$\langle [\mathcal{D}, \delta_{[V_j, \bar{V}_k]}]u_h, u_h\rangle \equiv 0.$$

Moreover, $\Theta(L, h_L) = -\Omega$ implies

$$c_{j,k} = -c_{j,k}(\Omega).$$

Thus we obtain (6.6) and 6.1 follows. □

Now let us study the relations among the terms in (8.29). The following theorem can be seen as a generalization of (5.3), (5.4) and Lemma 3.6 in [38]:

Theorem 8.6. *Each* $(D^{\mathcal{A}}_{\partial/\partial t_j} u_h)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp} = (\mu_j)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}$ *is the* L^2*-minimal solution of*

$$\bar\partial(\cdot) = -[\partial^\phi, \kappa_j]u_h - c_j,\ c_j := (V_j \rfloor \Theta(L, h_L))|_{X_t} \wedge u_h; \tag{8.30}$$

and each $(D^{\mathcal{K}}_{\partial/\partial \bar t_j} u_h)_\perp = (\nu_j)_\perp$ *is the* L^2*-minimal solution of*

$$\partial^\phi * (\cdot) = -[\bar\partial, \kappa_j^*] * u_h - c_j^*,\ c_j^* := (\bar V_j \rfloor \Theta(L, h_L))|_{X_t} \wedge *u_h. \tag{8.31}$$

Proof. Since $\mu_j = [\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}]\tilde u_h$ and $\kappa_j = [\bar\partial, \delta_{V_j}]|_{X_t}$, the first part of this lemma follows from

$$[\bar\partial, [\partial^\phi, \delta_{V_j}]] + [\partial^\phi, [\bar\partial, \delta_{V_j}]] + [\delta_{V_j}, [\bar\partial, \partial^\phi]] = 0.$$

For the second part, by (8.24), we have

$$*\nu_j = \tilde *[\bar\partial, \delta_{\bar V_j}]\tilde u_h = [\bar\partial, \delta_{\bar V_j}]\tilde * \tilde u_h.$$

Thus the second identity follows from

$$[\partial^\phi, [\bar\partial, \delta_{\bar V_j}]] + [\bar\partial, [\partial^\phi, \delta_{\bar V_j}]] + [\delta_{\bar V_j}, [\bar\partial, \partial^\phi]] = 0.$$

Now it suffices to show that $(\nu_j)_\perp$ is the L^2-minimal solution, i.e. we have to check $\bar\partial((\nu_j)_\perp) = 0$. Notice that $\bar\partial((\nu_j)_\perp) = \bar\partial\nu_j$, we know it is enough to prove $\bar\partial[\bar\partial, \delta_{\bar V_j}]\tilde u_h = 0$ on fibers. But since $\bar\partial\tilde u_h = 0$ on fibers, by (8.15), we know that $[\bar\partial, \delta_{\bar V_j}]\bar\partial\tilde u_h = 0$ on fibers. Now notice that

$$\bar\partial[\bar\partial, \delta_{\bar V_j}]\tilde u_h = [\bar\partial, \delta_{\bar V_j}]\bar\partial\tilde u_h,$$

Thus $\bar\partial[\bar\partial, \delta_{\bar V_j}]\tilde u_h = 0$ on fibers. The proof is complete. □

As first observed in [3], the theorem above suggests the use of Hörmander's L^2-estimate [14] in order to evaluate the contribution of each term in $\Theta^{\mathcal{H}}$. This can be done in a few important cases, as we will explain next.

• *The case* $p + q = n$, $\Theta(L, h_L) = \pm\Omega$. In this case, since each V_j is horizontal with respect to Ω, we have $c_j = c_j^* \equiv 0$. Moreover, the proof of Lemma 2.3 implies that all L_t-valued harmonic (p, q)-forms are primitive. Hence (8.30) and (8.31) reduce to

$$\bar\partial((\mu_j)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}) = -\partial^\phi\eta_j,\ \partial^\phi((\nu_j)_\perp) = -\bar\partial\xi_j, \tag{8.32}$$

thus we get the same equations in previous sections. Apply Hörmander's L^2-estimate as in the proof of Proposition 2.4, we get Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.2.

• *The case* $\Theta(L, h_L) \equiv 0$ *on* $\mathcal{X}$. Since $\Box' = \Box''$, we know that all u_h are also ∂^ϕ-closed and $(\partial^\phi)^*$-closed. Notice that $c_j = c_j^* = 0$, thus Theorem 8.6 implies

$$\bar\partial((\mu_j)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}) = -\partial^\phi\eta_j,\ \partial^\phi(*(\nu_j)_\perp) = -\bar\partial\kappa_j^* * u_h = \bar\partial * \xi_j. \tag{8.33}$$

Now we have

$$\langle (\mu_j)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}, (\mu_k)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}\rangle = \langle \bar\partial^* G(-\partial^\phi \eta_j), (\mu_k)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}\rangle = \langle G(\partial^\phi \eta_j), \partial^\phi \eta_k\rangle.$$

But since $\bar\partial \tilde * u_h = 0$ on fibers, we have

$$(\partial^\phi)^* \eta_j = -\tilde * \bar\partial \tilde * [\bar\partial, \delta_{V_j}]\tilde u_h = \tilde * \bar\partial [\bar\partial, \delta_{V_j}]\tilde * u_h = \tilde * [\bar\partial, \delta_{V_j}]\bar\partial \tilde * u_h = 0,$$

on fibers. Thus

$$\langle (\mu_j)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}, (\mu_k)_{\mathcal{K}^\perp}\rangle = \langle (\partial^\phi)^* G(\partial^\phi \eta_j), \eta_k\rangle = \langle G(\Box' \eta_j), \eta_k\rangle = \langle (\eta_j)_\perp, (\eta_k)_\perp\rangle.$$

By a similar argument, we have

$$\langle (\nu_j)_\perp, (\nu_k)_\perp\rangle = \langle *(\nu_j)_\perp, *(\nu_k)_\perp\rangle = \langle (*\xi_j)_\perp, (*\xi_k)_\perp\rangle.$$

Since in this case, $*$ is commute with $\Box'' = \Box'$, we have $(*\xi_j)_\perp = *(\xi_j)_\perp$, thus

$$\langle (\nu_j)_\perp, (\nu_k)_\perp\rangle = \langle (\xi_j)_\perp, (\xi_k)_\perp\rangle.$$

Moreover, we have $c_{j,k} \equiv 0$ and

$$\langle [\mathcal{D}, \delta_{[V_j, \bar V_k]}] u_h, u_h\rangle = 0,$$

since $\mathcal{D} u_h = 0$ on fibers. Thus Theorem 8.5 implies the following Griffiths formula:

$$\langle \Theta^{\mathcal{H}}_{j\bar k} u_h, u_h\rangle = -\langle (\xi_k)_h, (\xi_j)_h\rangle + \langle (\eta_j)_h, (\eta_k)_h\rangle. \tag{8.34}$$

In the next section, we shall give a generalization of the Griffiths formula.

• *The case $p = n$.* In this case the main results obtained in [38] (see also [22] and [23] for related results) are as follows.

Theorem 8.7. [38] *Assume that (L, h_L) is q-semipositive. Then $\mathcal{H}^{n,q}$ is Griffiths-semipositive.*

Theorem 8.8. [38] *Assume that (L, h_L) is q-semipositive. Assume further that $\ker \Box'' = \ker \Box'$ on L-valued (n, q)-forms on X_t for every $t \in B$. Then $\mathcal{H}^{n,q}$ is Nakano-semipositive.*

Remark 7. In case $q = 0$ and L is a line bundle, the above theorem is just the main theorem in [4]. In general, it generalizes the the result in [21]. □

8.4. **Flat case.** In this subsection, we shall consider the case that L is a semi-negative line bunde that is Hermitian-flat on fibers, i.e.

$$\Theta(L, h_L) \le 0,$$

on $\mathcal{X}$ and

$$\Theta(L, h_L)|_{X_t} \equiv 0,$$

for every $t \in B$. The starting point is the following proposition:

Proposition 8.9. *$\Theta(L, h_L)$ is the pull back of a d-closed form on B.*

Proof. Let us assume that B is one dimensional (the proof of the general case is essentially the same). We claim that $\Theta(L, h_L)$ can be written locally as

$$\Theta(L, h_L) = \lambda(t, z) dt \wedge d\bar{t}.$$

In fact, since $\Theta \equiv 0$ on fibers, we can locally write

$$\Theta(L, h_L) = \lambda(t, z) dt \wedge d\bar{t} + \sum f_j dt \wedge d\bar{z}_j + \sum \bar{f}_j dz_j \wedge d\bar{t}.$$

Now $\Theta(L, h_L) \leq 0$ implies that $\lambda \leq 0$ and $f_j \equiv 0$. Thus our claim is true. Now notice that $\bar{\partial}\Theta(L, h_L) \equiv 0$, thus $z \mapsto \lambda(t, z)$ is holomorphic on X_t, which implies that λ does not depend on z. Thus $\Theta(L, h_L)$ is the pull-back of a d-closed form on B. □

Remark 8. The above proposition implies that for every $t \in B$, one may find a sufficiently small neighborhood, say U, of t and a smooth function, say $\psi(t)$, on U such that $\Theta(L, h_L) = p^*(\partial\bar{\partial}\psi(t))$, which implies $\Theta(L, e^{\psi} h_L) \equiv 0$ on $p^{-1}(U)$. Using Griffiths formula (8.34) for $(L, e^{\psi} h_L)$, we get:

Theorem 8.10. *Assume that $i\Theta(L, h_L)$ is semi-negative and Hermitian-flat on fibers. Then we have the following curvature formula:*

$$\langle \Theta^{\mathcal{H}}_{j\bar{k}} u_h, u_h \rangle = c_{j,k} ||u_h||^2 - \langle (\xi_k)_h, (\xi_j)_h \rangle + \langle (\eta_j)_h, (\eta_k)_h \rangle.$$

In particular, we have $\langle \Theta^{\mathcal{H}}_{j\bar{j}} u_h, u_h \rangle \leq -||(\xi_j)_h||^2 + ||(\eta_j)_h||^2$.

□

9. Extension of the metric

In this section the set-up is as follows. We are given a surjective map $p : X \to Y$ between two smooth projective manifolds, such that the fibers of p are connected (this last condition is not really necessary...). This will be referred to as *algebraic fiber space*. Such a map p will not be a submersion in general, so we cannot use directly the results obtained in the previous sections. In order to formulate our next results, we will recall next the notion of *logarithmic tangent bundle* cf. [10], which offers the right context to deal with the (eventual) singularities of p.

9.1. **Notations, conventions and statements.** Let $(W_\alpha)_{\alpha \in J}$ be a finite set of non-singular hypersurfaces of X which have transverse intersections. The logarithmic tangent bundle $T_X\langle W \rangle$ is the vector bundle whose local frame in a coordinate set U is given by

$$z_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}, \ldots, z_k \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{k+1}}, \ldots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_n} \tag{9.1}$$

where $z_1, \ldots, z_n$ are coordinates defined on U, such that $W_j \cap U = (z_j = 0)$ for $j = 1, \ldots k$. Hence we assume implicitly that only k among the hypersurfaces W_α intersect the coordinate set U. We remark that the logarithmic tangent bundle is a subsheaf of T_X; its dual is the logarithmic cotangent bundle $\Omega_X\langle W \rangle$.

Throughout the current section we will observe the following conventions.

• We denote by $\Sigma \subset Y$ the set of singular values of p. Let $\Delta \subset \Sigma$ be the codimension one subset of Σ. We assume that the components of Δ are smooth and have transverse intersections. Note that the closure of the difference $\Sigma \setminus \Delta$ is a set of codimension at least two.
• Let $B \subset Y \setminus \Sigma$ the Zariski open subset of Y for which the dimension of the relevant cohomology groups (1.3) is constant.
• We assume that there exists a Zariski open subset $\mathcal{Y}_0 \subset Y$ whose codimension is greater than two, such that if we denote $\mathcal{X}_0 := p^{-1}(\mathcal{Y}_0)$ then the following holds.

For any x_0 and y_0 in $\mathcal{X}_0$ and $\mathcal{Y}_0$ respectively, such that $p(x_0) = y_0$ we have local coordinates $(z_1, \dots z_{n+m})$ centered at x_0 and $(t_1, \dots t_m)$ centered at y_0 with respect to which the map p is given by

$$(z_1, \dots, z_{m+n}) \to (z_{n+1}, \dots, z_{n+m-1}, z_{n+m}^{b_{n+m}} \prod_{j=1}^{q} z_j^{b_j}) \tag{9.2}$$

where $b_l \geq 1$ above are strict positive integers and $q \leq n$. Moreover, locally near y_0 the set $\Delta \setminus \Sigma$ is given by the equation $t_m = 0$.

Remark 9. Given an algebraic fiber space $f : \widetilde{X} \to Y$, part of the properties above can be achieved modulo the modification of the total space $\pi : X \to \widetilde{X}$ along the inverse image of the discriminant of f. Also, if the discriminant Δ is not a simple normal crossing divisor, we consider a log-resolution of (Y, Δ), together with the corresponding fibered product. Hence up to such transformations we can assume without loss of generality that the bullets above hold true for the maps p we are considering. □

We will denote by $T_Y\langle\Delta\rangle$ the logarithmic tangent bundle of (Y, Δ) described locally as in (9.1); let $\Omega_Y\langle\Delta\rangle$ be its dual.

We have the following easy and well-known statement, consequence of the bullets above.

Lemma 9.1. *We have a natural morphism of vector bundles*

$$p^\star\left(\Omega_Y\langle\Delta\rangle\right) \to \Omega_X\langle W\rangle \tag{9.3}$$

which is defined and injective on $\mathcal{X}_0$.

Proof. The verification is immediate: in the complement of the divisor Δ things are clear. Let x_0 and y_0 in X and Y respectively be two points as in (ii). We have the coordinates (z_i) and (t_j) with respect to which the map p writes as in (9.2). Then we have

$$p^\star(dt_j) = dz_{n+j} \tag{9.4}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, m-1$ and

$$p^\star\left(\frac{dt_m}{t_m}\right) = b_{n+m}\frac{dz_{n+m}}{z_{n+m}} + \sum_{i=1}^{q} b_i \frac{dz_i}{z_i}. \tag{9.5}$$

Thus the lemma is proved, given that the right hand side of (9.5) is a local section of $\Omega_X\langle W\rangle$. □

We note that the map (9.3) is an injection of sheaves on X, but in order to obtain an injection of vector bundles, in general we have to restrict to $\mathcal{X}_0$ (as one sees by considering the blow-up of a point in $\mathbb{C}^2$).

Let $\Omega_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle$ be the co-kernel of (9.3), so that we have the exact sequence

$$0 \to p^\star\left(\Omega_Y\langle\Delta\rangle\right) \to \Omega_X\langle W\rangle \to \Omega_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \to 0 \tag{9.6}$$

on the open set $\mathcal{X}_0 \subset X$.
For further use, we will give next the expression of a local frame of the bundle $\Omega_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle$ with respect to the coordinates z and t considered above. Let $U \subset \mathcal{X}_0$ be the open set, on which the functions z_j are defined. Then the local frame of $\Omega_X\langle W\rangle|_U$ are given by

$$\frac{dz_1}{z_1}, \ldots, \frac{dz_q}{z_q}, dz_{q+1}, \ldots, dz_{n+m-1}, \frac{dz_{n+m}}{z_{n+m}}. \tag{9.7}$$

Thus, the local frame of $\Omega_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle|_U$ is given by the symbols

$$\frac{dz_1}{z_1}, \ldots, \frac{dz_q}{z_q}, dz_{q+1}, \ldots, dz_n, \frac{dz_{n+m}}{z_{n+m}} \tag{9.8}$$

modulo the relation

$$b_{n+m}\frac{dz_{n+m}}{z_{n+m}} + \sum_{j=1}^{q} b_j \frac{dz_j}{z_j} = 0. \tag{9.9}$$

The edge morphism corresponding to the direct image of the dual of (9.3) gives the analogue of the Kodaira-Spencer map in logarithmic setting, as follows

$$ks : T_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \to \mathcal{R}^1 p_\star T_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle. \tag{9.10}$$

It turns out that we have

$$T_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \simeq \Omega^{n-1}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes K^{-1}_{X/Y} \otimes \mathcal{O}(p^\star(\Delta) - W), \tag{9.11}$$

on $\mathcal{X}_0$, hence we can rewrite (9.10) as follows

$$ks : T_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \to \mathcal{R}^1 p_\star \left(\Omega^{n-1}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right). \tag{9.12}$$

provided that the twisting bundle equals

$$L := K^{-1}_{X/Y} \otimes \mathcal{O}\left(p^\star(\Delta) - W\right). \tag{9.13}$$

Hence, this fits perfectly into the framework developed in this article.

In general, given any bundle L and an index $i \geq 0$ we have a map

$$\tau^i : \mathcal{R}^i p_\star \left(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right) \to \mathcal{R}^{i+1} p_\star \left(\Omega^{n-i-1}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right) \otimes \Omega_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \tag{9.14}$$

obtained by contraction with (9.10). A local section of $\mathcal{R}^i p_\star \left(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right)$ is represented by a $(0,i)$-form with values in the $(n-i)$ exterior power of the relative logarithmic cotangent bundle twisted with L. We couple this form with the $(0,1)$-form with values in the logarithmic tangent bundle of X corresponding to a local section of $T_Y\langle\Delta\rangle$ via (9.10). The result is a $(0,i+1)$-form with values in the $(n-i-1)$ exterior power of the logarithmic cotangent bundle twisted with L.

This is the map (9.14); as we see, it is only defined in the complement of a set of codimension at least two in Y. We denote by $\mathcal{K}^i$ its kernel; it is a subsheaf of $\mathcal{R}^i p_\star \left(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right)$. We can assume that the restriction $\mathcal{K}^i|_B$ is a subbundle of $\mathcal{R}^i p_\star \left(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right)\big|_B$.

Remark 10. In view of our main formula (cf. Theorem 6.1), it is clear that the curvature of $\mathcal{K}^i|_B$ has better chances to be semi-negative than the full bundle $\mathcal{R}^i p_\star \left(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right)$. Indeed, if the section $[u]$ in 6.1 is a local holomorphic section of $\mathcal{K}^i|_B$, then the fiberwise projection of the η_j's on the space of harmonic forms is identically zero. □

The sheaves $\mathcal{K}^i$ have been extensively studied in algebraic geometry, cf. [40], [7] and the references therein. We will be concerned here with their differential geometric properties. To this end, we formulate the requirements below concerning Hermitian bundle (L, h_L).

$(\mathcal{H}_1)$ We have $\Theta_{h_L}(L) \leq 0$ on X and moreover $\Theta_{h_L}(L)|_{X_y} = 0$ for each y in the complement of some Zariski closed set.

$(\mathcal{H}_2)$ We have $\Theta_{h_L}(L) \leq 0$ on X and moreover there exists a Kähler metric ω_Y on Y such that we have $\Theta_{h_L}(L) \wedge p^\star\omega_Y^m \leq -\varepsilon_0\omega \wedge p^\star\omega_Y^m$ on X.

Thus the first condition requires L to be semi-negative and trivial on fibers, whereas in $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ we assume that L is uniformly strictly negative on fibers, in the sense that we have

$$\Theta_{h_L}(L)|_{X_y} \leq -\varepsilon_0\omega|_{X_y} \tag{9.15}$$

for any regular value y of the map p.

As in the introduction, we denote by $\mathcal{K}^i_f$ the quotient of $\mathcal{K}^i$ by its torsion subsheaf. In this context we have the following result.

Theorem 9.2. *Let $p : X \to Y$ be an algebraic fiber space, and let (L, h_L) be a Hermitian line bundle which satisfies one of the hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_i)$ above. We assume that the restriction of h_L to the generic fiber of p is non-singular. Then:*

- *(a) For each $i \geq 1$ the bundle $\mathcal{K}^i_f$ admits a semi-negatively curved singular Hermitian metric. Moreover, this metric is smooth on a Zariski open subset of Y.*
- *(b) We assume that curvature form of L is smaller than $-\varepsilon_0 p^\star\omega_Y$ on the p-inverse image of some open subset $\Omega \subset Y$ of Y. Then the metric on $\mathcal{K}^i_f$ is strongly negatively curved on Ω (and semi-negatively curved in the complement a codimension greater than two subset of Y).*

The method of proof of Theorem 9.2 also gives the following statement, which is potentially important in the analysis of families of holomorphic disks tangent to the pair (Y, Δ). Prior to stating this result, we define the "iterated Kodaira-Spencer map", cf. [30]

$$ks^{(i)} : \mathrm{Sym}^i T_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \otimes \mathcal{R}^0 p_\star \left(\Omega^n_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right) \to \mathcal{R}^i p_\star \left(\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right) \tag{9.16}$$

by contracting successively the sections of $\Omega^\bullet_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L$ with the $T_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle$-valued $(0,1)$-forms given by ks in (9.10) (we remark that the contraction operations are commutative, and this is the

reason why the map (9.16) is defined on Sym^i rather than $\otimes^i$ of the log tangent bundle of the base).

Proposition 9.3. *We assume that the singularities of the map p are contained in the snc divisor Δ. Let $\omega_{\mathcal{P},X}$ and $\omega_{\mathcal{P},Y}$ be two Kähler metrics with Poincaré singularities on (X, W) and (Y, Δ) respectively. We assume that the metric h_L of L is smooth when restricted to the p-inverse image of a Zariski open subset of Y, and that its weights are bounded from below. Then for each $i \geq 1$ we have*

$$\|ks^{(i)}\|_y^{2/i} \leq C \log^N \frac{1}{|s_{\Delta,y}|^2}, \tag{9.17}$$

where the norm (9.17) *is induced by the metrics $\omega_{\mathcal{P},X}$ and $\omega_{\mathcal{P},Y}$. The constants C, N are depending on everything but the point $y \in Y$.*

Remark 11. The proof of Proposition 9.3 is very similar to the arguments we will give for Theorem 9.2, and we have decided that we can afford to skip it. We will however highlight the main points after completing the arguments for 9.2. □

Assume that the bundle (L, h_L) verifies one of the hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_i)$, and that moreover we have

$$H^0\left(X, \Omega^n_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right) \neq 0. \tag{9.18}$$

If σ is a holomorphic section of $\Omega^n_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L$, then we have a holomorphic map

$$ks^{(1)}_\sigma : {}_Y \to \mathcal{R}^1 p_\star \left(\Omega^{n-1}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L\right) \otimes \Omega_Y\langle\Delta\rangle. \tag{9.19}$$

induced by the map $ks^{(1)}$ cf. (9.16).

We formulate yet another hypothesis.

$(\mathcal{H}_3)$ There exists a holomorphic section σ of $\Omega^n_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L$ such that the map $ks^{(1)}_\sigma$ is not identically zero when restricted to a non-empty subset of B.

The following result is a corollary of Theorem 9.2.

Theorem 9.4. *Let $p : X \to Y$ be an algebraic fiber space, and let (L, h_L) be a Hermitian line bundle which satisfies one of the hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_j)$ for $j = 1, 2$. Moreover, we assume that $(\mathcal{H}_3)$ is equally satisfied. Then there exists $s \leq m = \dim(Y)$ and a non-trivial map*

$$\mathcal{K}_f^{s\star} \to \mathrm{Sym}^s \Omega_Y\langle\Delta\rangle. \tag{9.20}$$

In addition, if the curvature of L is smaller than $-\varepsilon_0 p^\star\omega_Y$ on the pre-image of some non-empty open subset V of Y, then there exists an ample line bundle A on Y such that the bundle

$$\otimes^M \Omega_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \otimes A^{-1}$$

has a (non-identically zero) global section, for some $M \gg 0$.

Our next results will show that in some interesting geometric consequences a version of the hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ is verified.

If the canonical bundle of the generic fiber of $p : X \to Y$ is ample, then we say that the family defined by p is *canonically polarized*. Next, a canonically polarized family p has *maximal variation* if the map (9.10) is injective when restricted to a non-empty open subset of $\mathcal{Y}_0$.

Then we have the following result, which provides a (geometric) sufficient condition under which the anti-canonical bundle of p has strong curvature properties.

Theorem 9.5. *Let $p : X \to Y$ be a family of canonically polarized manifolds of maximal variation, and let ω be a reference metric on X. Then there exists an effective divisor Ξ in X and a metric $h_{X/Y}$ on the twisted relative canonical bundle $K_{X/Y} + \Xi$ such that the following hold true.*

(i) The curvature corresponding to $h_{X/Y}$ is greater than $\varepsilon_0\omega$ for some $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and the restriction $h_{X/Y}|_{X_y}$ is non-singular for all y in the complement of a Zariski closed subset of Y.

(ii) The codimension of the direct image $p(\Xi)$ is greater than two.

Remark 12. Given that K_{X_y} is ample, a natural choice for the construction of a positively curved metric on $K_{X/Y}$ would be the fiberwise KE metric, cf. previous section –this is well defined in the complement of the singular locus of p, and it extends across the singularities, cf. [25]. However, it is not clear for us whether it is possible to obtain a *useful* lower bound of the eigenvalues of the KE metric with respect to a fixed Kähler metric on X as we are approaching the singular locus of p. And this information is critical in the process of extending the metric, as we will see below. □

In order to derive an interesting consequence of Theorem 9.5 we recall the following result.

Theorem 9.6. [5] *We assume that the hypothesis of Theorem 9.5 are satisfied. Then there exists a metric $h^{(1)}_{X/Y}$ on the relative canonical bundle $K_{X/Y}$ with the following properties.*

(i) The restriction of $h^{(1)}_{X/Y}$ to the fiber $X_y := p^{-1}(y)$ is smooth. It is induced by the sections of mK_{X_y} for some $m \gg 0$, for all y in the complement of a proper algebraic subset $Z \subset Y$.

(ii) The corresponding curvature current Θ is positive definite on each compact subset of $p^{-1}(Y \setminus Z)$, and moreover we have

$$\Theta \geq \sum (t^j - 1)[W_j] \tag{9.21}$$

in the sense of currents on X.

In the statement (9.6) we denote by t^j the multiplicity of the hypersurface W_j in the inverse image $p^{-1}(\Delta)$. By combining Theorem 9.5 and Theorem 9.6, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 9.7. *Let $\eta > 0$ be a positive real number. We assume that the hypothesis of Theorem 9.5 are satisfied, and we define the following family of metrics:*

$$\varphi^{(\eta)}_{X/Y} := \eta\varphi_{X/Y} + (1-\eta)\varphi^{(1)}_{X/Y} - \sum (t^j - 1)\log|f_j|^2 \tag{9.22}$$

on the bundle $K_{X/Y}-\sum(t^j-1)W_j$, where $\varphi_{X/Y}$ and $\varphi^{(1)}_{X/Y}$ are the weights given by Theorem 9.5 and Theorem 9.6, respectively, and f_j is a local equation of the hypersurface W_j. The resulting metrics $h^{(\eta)}_{X/Y}$ have the following properties.

(a) The curvature current Θ_η verifies

$$\Theta_\eta \geq \eta\varepsilon_0\omega - \eta\sum(t^j-1)[W_j] - \eta[\Xi].$$

(b) Each of the metrics $h^{(\eta)}_{X/Y}$ is smooth when restricted to the generic fiber of p.

(c) For each compact subset $K \subset X \setminus p^{-1}(\Delta)$ we have $\Theta_\eta|_K \geq C_K\omega|_K$, where $C_K > 0$ is independent of η.

Thus, in the set-up of Theorem 9.5 the point (a) of Corollary 9.7 shows that a version of hypothesis $(\mathcal{H})_2$ is satisfied. We will show at the end of this section that that this suffices to infer that Theorem 9.2 holds true for $L := -K_{X/Y} + \sum(t^j-1)W_j$, endowed with the metric deduced from $h^{(1)}_{X/Y}$.

The following important result due to Viehweg-Zuo (cf. [36]) can now be seen as a direct consequence of the results 9.2, 9.4 and9.5.

Theorem 9.8. [36] *Let $p : X \to Y$ be a family of canonically polarized manifolds of maximal variation. Then there exists a positive integer $q \leq \dim(Y)$ such that the bundle $\mathrm{Sym}^q\,\Omega_Y\langle\Delta\rangle$ contains a non-trivial big coherent subsheaf.*

In the following subsections we will establish the results stated above.

9.2. **Proof of Theorem 9.2.** Our first task will be to construct a metric on the quotient

$$\mathcal{K}^i_f := \mathcal{K}^i/T(\mathcal{K}^i) \tag{9.23}$$

of the kernel by its torsion subsheaf. This will be naturally induced by the metric on the direct image, thanks to the following simple observation.

Lemma 9.9. *The support of the torsion subsheaf $T(\mathcal{K}^i)$ is contained in $Y \setminus B$.*

This is clear, since $\mathcal{K}^i|_B$ is a vector bundle.

Next, the sheaf $\mathcal{K}^i_f$ is coherent and torsion-free, therefore it is locally free on an open subset $\mathcal{Y}_0$ whose codimension in Y is at least two. We define next a metric on the restriction $\mathcal{K}^i_f|_B$ as follows.

Let s_1, s_2 be local sections of $\mathcal{K}^i_f$ defined on an open set V such that the sequence

$$0 \to \Gamma\left(V, T(\mathcal{K}^i)\right) \to \Gamma\left(V, \mathcal{K}^i\right) \to \Gamma\left(V, \mathcal{K}^i_f\right) \to 0 \tag{9.24}$$

is exact. We consider two sections $u_1, u_2 \in \Gamma\left(V, \mathcal{K}^i\right)$ projecting into s_1 and s_2, respectively via (9.24). Then for each $t \in B \cap V$ we define

$$\langle s_1, s_2\rangle_t := \langle u_1, u_2\rangle_t. \tag{9.25}$$

We note that this does not depends on the u_i's by Lemma 9.9, and therefore we have a well-defined Hermitian structure on $\mathcal{K}_f^i|_B$.

Next, we will use the Leray isomorphism in order to construct a representative of a local section $[u]$ of $\mathcal{K}^i$. Since this is slightly different from the convention adopted in the previous sections, we give a few precisons in what follows.

Assume that $[u]$ is defined on a small enough open subset $V \subset Y$ containing a smooth point of the divisor Δ. In particular, $[u]$ corresponds to an element of the cohomology group

$$H^i\left(p^{-1}(V), \Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L|_{p^{-1}(V)}\right). \tag{9.26}$$

Let $\mathcal{U} = (U_\alpha)$ be a finite cover of X, such that the intersections $U_I := U_{\alpha_0} \cap \cdots \cap U_{\alpha_s}$ are contractible for all multi-indexes $I = (\alpha_0 < \cdots < \alpha_s)$ having $s+1$ components and all s.

The section $[u]$ corresponds to a collection of holomorphic sections (u_I) of the bundle

$$\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L|_{U_I}$$

whose Cech co-boundary is equal to zero (i.e. it is a cocycle). Here the multi-index I has $i+1$ components. We can assume that the map

$$\Omega^{n-i}_{X}\langle W\rangle \otimes L|_{U_I} \to \Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L|_{U_I} \tag{9.27}$$

is surjective at the level of sections. Let $\widetilde{u}_I$ be a lifting of the section u_I via the map (9.27). Each $\widetilde{u}_I$ is an L-valued $n-i$-form with log poles on U_I. We note that in general the collection $(\widetilde{u}_I)$ is not necessarily a cocycle. However, this is the case for the restriction $(\widetilde{u}_I|_{U_I\cap X_t})$ for each $t \in B$, and this identifies with the class $[u_t]$.

We apply the Leray isomorphism procedure to $(\widetilde{u}_I)$; this gives a $(0,i)$-form with values in $\Omega^{n-i}_X\langle W\rangle \otimes L|_{p^{-1}(V)}$ which we denote by $\widetilde{u}$. The exact formula is as follows

$$\widetilde{u} = \sum_I \rho_{\alpha_s}\widetilde{u}_{\alpha_0\ldots\alpha_s}\bar\partial\rho_{\alpha_0}\wedge\cdots\wedge\bar\partial\rho_{\alpha_{s-1}} \tag{9.28}$$

where (ρ_α) is a partition of unit subordinate to the Leray cover $\mathcal{U}$. In the usual formula, we do not have the factor ρ_{α_s} in (9.28), since the forms defined on the open sets U_{α_s} coincide on intersections. As already mentioned, here $(\widetilde{u}_I)$ is not necessarily a cocycle, but this is the case for the projection (u_I). Since $\sum \rho_j = 1$, the image of $\widetilde{u}$ on the space of $(0,i)$-forms with values in $\Omega^{n-i}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L|_{p^{-1}(V)}$ is $\bar\partial$-closed and it represents the class $[u]$.

– *Convention.*– For the rest of this section, we will call $\widetilde{u}$ a representative of $[u]$. Also, the representative of a section u of $\mathcal{K}_f^i$ will be by definition the representative of a section of $\mathcal{K}^i$ projecting into u.

Let $\widetilde{u}$ be a fixed representative of a local section of the bundle $\mathcal{K}_f^i$, which is defined near a smooth point $y_0 \in \Delta$. Thus $\widetilde{u}$ is a $(0,i)$-form with values in the bundle $\Omega^{n-i}_X\langle W\rangle \otimes L|_{p^{-1}(V)}$, such that the following properties are satisfied for any $t \in B \cap V$.

• The restriction of the form $\widetilde{u}$ to the fibers X_t is $\bar\partial$-closed.

• The cup-product of $\widetilde{u}$ with any element in the image of ks is cohomologically zero when restricted to X_t.

We first assume that the bundle (L, h_L) verifies the hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_2)$. Let $\theta := -\Theta_{h_L}(L)$ be the corresponding curvature form. Then we have

$$\sqrt{-1}c_{jk}(\theta)dt_j \wedge d\overline{t}_k \geq 0 \tag{9.29}$$

and given that $\widetilde{u}$ is a section of the kernel, the fiberwise projection of the (troublesome) forms η_j on the space of harmonic forms is equal to zero (as above, we assume that $t \in B$). Thus, for any local holomorphic section u of $\mathcal{K}_f^i$ defined on an open set V centered at the point y_0 the function

$$t \to \log \|[u]\|_t^2 \tag{9.30}$$

is psh on $V \setminus \Delta$, as a consequence of Theorem 6.1 (the bracket notation in (9.30) has the same meaning as in section 2). We will show next that we have

$$\sup_{t \in V \setminus \Delta} \log \|[u]\|_t^2 < \infty \tag{9.31}$$

and then Theorem 9.2 follows as a consequence of elementary properties of psh functions.

In order to establish (9.31), by the definition of the norm of a section of $\mathcal{H}^{p,q}$ we have the inequality

$$\|[u]\|_t^2 \leq \int_{X_t} \left|\widetilde{u}_{|X_t}\right|_{\theta,h_L}^2 \theta^n \tag{9.32}$$

for each $t \in V \setminus \Delta$. Hence it would be enough to bound the right hand side term of (9.32). Unfortunately we cannot do this directly (as the following computations will show, the technical reason is that we do not have an upper bound for the eigenvalues of θ at our disposal) and we will proceed as follows.

By hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ the form θ is semi-positive on X and greater than $\varepsilon_0\omega$ on the fibers of p. For each j let s_j be the global section whose set of zeroes is the hypersurface W_j (recall that the W_j are the support of the inverse image $p^{-1}(\Delta)$). They correspond locally on the open set U (cf. (9.2)) to the coordinates $z_1, \ldots, z_q, z_{m+n}$. We have the decomposition $U := \bigcup U_j$, where $U_j \subset U$ corresponds to the set of points for which $|z_j|$ is minimum among $|z_1|, \ldots, |z_q|, |z_{n+m}|$. If $j = 1, \ldots, q$ then on the open set $U_j \cap X_t$ of the fiber X_t we take the local coordinates $z_1, \ldots z_{j-1}, z_{n+m}, z_{j+1}, \ldots, z_n$. On the set $X_t \cap U_{n+m}$ the coordinates are $z_1, \ldots, z_n$.
There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for each $\varepsilon > 0$, on $X_t \cap U_{n+m}$ we have

$$\theta - \varepsilon \sum_j dd^c \log\log \frac{1}{|s_j|^2} \geq C\sqrt{-1}\left(\sum_{j=1}^n dz_j \wedge d\overline{z}_j + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^q \frac{dz_j \wedge d\overline{z}_j}{|z_j|^2 \log^2 |z_j|^2}\right). \tag{9.33}$$

The inequality (9.33) is a direct consequence of the fact that θ is greater than $\varepsilon_0\omega$ on the fibers of p, by hypothesis. We thus change the metric on L in order to have Poincaré singularities on fibers.

In order to apply Theorem 6.1, we perturb the metric of L as follows

$$h_{L,\varepsilon} := \left(\prod_j \log^\varepsilon \frac{1}{|s_j|^2}\right)^{-1} \left(\log^{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{|t_m|^2}\right)^{-1} e^{C\sqrt{\varepsilon}|t|^2} h_L \tag{9.34}$$

and let θ_ε be the opposite of resulting curvature form (whose restriction to fibers is none other than the left hand side of (9.33)). The constant $C \gg 0$ in (9.34) is chosen so that θ_ε still verifies $(\mathcal{H}_2)$, for each positive $\varepsilon > 0$. We remark that the negativity induced by the first factor of (9.34) in the expression of θ_ε is of order $\sum_j \frac{\varepsilon}{\log 1/|s_j|^2}\omega$. This is compensated by the the functions depending on t only in (9.34).
We clearly have

$$\lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \|[u]\|^2_{\varepsilon,t} = \|[u]\|^2_t \tag{9.35}$$

for every $t \in V \setminus \Delta$. In (9.35) above we denote by $\|\cdot\|^2_{\varepsilon,t}$ the norm induced by the perturbed metric of L. The equality (9.35) is a consequence of the usual elliptic theory, cf. [17], applied for each t.

We formulate the following claim, where we recall that $\widetilde{u}$ is a representative of the section u.

Claim. For each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that we have

$$\sup_{t\in V\setminus\Delta} |t_m|^{2\varepsilon} \int_{X_t} \left|\widetilde{u}_{|X_t}\right|^2_{\theta_\varepsilon, h_{L,\varepsilon}} \theta^n_\varepsilon \leq C_\varepsilon < \infty. \tag{9.36}$$

If we are able to show that (9.36) holds true, then we are done (despite of the fact that the constant C_ε above may not be bounded as $\varepsilon \to 0$). Indeed, this would imply that the log of the expression

$$t \to |t_m|^{2\varepsilon} \|[u]\|^2_{\varepsilon,t} \tag{9.37}$$

defines a psh function on V for each $\varepsilon > 0$. We write the corresponding mean inequality

$$\log\left(|\tau|^{2\varepsilon}\|[u]\|^2_{\varepsilon,(t',\tau)}\right) \leq \varepsilon C + \int_0^{2\pi} \log \|[u]\|^2_{\varepsilon,(t',\tau_\theta)} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} \tag{9.38}$$

where we use the notation $\tau_\theta := \tau + re^{\sqrt{i}\theta}$ under the integral sign in (9.38), and $0 < r \ll 1$.

On the other hand, if $|t_m| = \delta_0 > 0$, then we have

$$\sup_{|t_m|=\delta_0,\, t\in V} \int_{X_t} |\widetilde{u}_{|X_t}|^2_{\theta_\varepsilon, h_{L,\varepsilon}} \theta^n_\varepsilon \leq C_0 \tag{9.39}$$

uniformly with respect to ε, since we are "away" from the singularities of the map p. The mean inequality (9.38), combined with (9.39), (9.35) and the concavity of the log function give the uniform boundedness of the initial norm, which is what we wanted.

In conclusion, the argument is that we will be using the non-effective estimate (9.36) in order to infer that the function (9.37) is log-psh. Then the uniform boundedness of our initial norm follows by the mean inequality, together with the convergence as $\varepsilon \to 0$ property (9.35).

Proof. To establish the claim we will use the local frame (9.8) in order to do a few local computations. Assume that z belongs to the coordinate set $U_{n+m} \subset U$. For each $t \in V \setminus \Delta$ the local

coordinates will be $z_1, \ldots, z_n$. We write

$$\widetilde{u}|_{X_t} = \sum_{I,J} \xi_{I\overline{J}}(z,t) \frac{dz_\alpha}{z_\alpha} \wedge dz_\beta \wedge d\overline{z}_J \otimes e_L \tag{9.40}$$

where α, β above are multi-indices whose union is equal to I; we assume that $\alpha \subset \{1, \ldots q\}$ and that $\beta \subset \{q+1, \ldots, n\}$. The length of I and J is $n-i$ and i, respectively.

The important remark is that the absolute value of the coefficients $\xi_{I\overline{J}}(\cdot, t)$ of the restriction (9.40) are bounded uniformly with respect to $t \in V \setminus \Delta$. This is quickly seen thanks to the relation (9.9), and the fact that the quotients $|z_{n+m}|/|z_j|$ are bounded from above on U_{n+m}.

In general, given two Kähler metrics g_1 and g_2 such that $g_1 \geq g_2$ then for any form γ of type $(n-i, i)$ we have

$$|\gamma|_{g_1} \leq |\gamma|_{g_2} \tag{9.41}$$

and in our setting this implies the inequality

$$\left|\widetilde{u}_{|X_t}\right|^2_{\theta_\varepsilon, h_{L,\varepsilon}} \leq C \frac{e^{-\varphi_{L,\varepsilon}}}{\varepsilon^2} \sum_{I,J} |\xi_{I\overline{J}}|^2 \prod_{j \in \alpha} \log^2 |z_j|^2 \tag{9.42}$$

at each point of the intersection $U_{n+m} \cap X_t$, cf. (9.33).

Next we remark that the local weights of the metric h_L are bounded from below, given the curvature hypothesis; this is also true for the perturbed metric $h_{L,\varepsilon}$ (and actually the lower bound is independent of ε).

On the other hand, for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that we have

$$|t_m|^{2\varepsilon} \prod_{j \in \alpha} \log^2 |z_j|^2 \leq C_\varepsilon \tag{9.43}$$

for any $z \in X_t \cap U$, cf. (9.2). We thus obtain

$$|t_m|^{2\varepsilon} \left|\widetilde{u}_{|X_t}\right|^2_{\theta_\varepsilon, h_{L,\varepsilon}} \leq C_\varepsilon(\xi) \tag{9.44}$$

where $C_\varepsilon(\xi)$ is uniform with respect to the point $t \in V \setminus \Delta$, as a consequence of (9.42) and (9.43).

All in all, we infer the existence of a constant $C_\varepsilon(\xi)$ such that we have

$$|t_m|^{2\varepsilon} \int_{X_t} \left|\widetilde{u}_{|X_t}\right|^2_{\theta_\varepsilon, h_{L,\varepsilon}} \theta_\varepsilon^n \leq C_\varepsilon(\xi) \tag{9.45}$$

because the volume of each fiber $(X_t, \theta_\varepsilon)$ is bounded from above by a positive constant independent of t (and ε). Therefore the claim is proved, and so is Theorem 9.2 in case the line bundle (L, h_L) verifies the hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_2$.

If the curvature of L is trivial when restricted to fibers of p, then we can use an arbitrary Kähler metric on X to define the norm on $\mathcal{K}^i$. Given this, the proof is completely identical, and we will not provide further details. □

Remark 13. One can also prove the claim by a slightly different argument, which avoids the use of the restriction (9.40). The observation is that we have

$$\left|\widetilde{u}_{|X_t}\right|^2_{\theta_\varepsilon, h_{L,\varepsilon}} \leq |\widetilde{u}|^2_{\theta_\varepsilon, h_{L,\varepsilon}} \tag{9.46}$$

at each point of the fiber X_t. This follows by a simple linear algebra calculation. The right hand side of (9.46) can be bounded from above by using the fact that θ_ε is a metric with Poincaré singularities when restricted to U. In the inequality (9.39) however, we have to work with the left hand side term of (9.46) directly, mainly because we have to obtain an upper bound which is independent of ε, and the metric h_L is only assumed to be strictly positively curved in the fibers directions. □

Remark 14. The proof of Theorem 9.2 is much easier than the one establishing the *positivity* of the direct image sheaf

$$\mathcal{F} := p_\star(K_{X/Y} + L)$$

in case (L, h_L) has is semi-positively curved. The reason is that in order to show that the natural metric of $\mathcal{F}$ extends across the eventual singularities of the map p one has to show that the function

$$t \to \|[u_t]\|^2_t$$

is bounded *from below* by a strictly positive constant, as soon as we have $[u_t]_{t_0} \notin m_0 \mathcal{F}_{t_0}$ where $t_0 \in V \cap \Delta$ and $m_0 \subset {}_{Y,t_0}$ is the maximal ideal associated to this point.
On the other hand, in Theorem 9.2 we assume that L is endowed with a metric whose curvature satisfies very strong uniformity requirements (with respect to the fibers of p). As we will see in Theorem 9.5, it is not always very easy to construct such metrics e.g. if $L = -K_{X/Y}$. □

As already mentioned, the proof of Proposition 9.3 is is practically contained in the arguments invoked for Theorem 9.2. The only additional tool would be the following statement, generalizing [10].

Lemma 9.10. *Let $\Omega \subset Y$ be a small coordinate set centered at the point y_0. For each $i = 1, \ldots, m$ there exists a vector field v_i defined on $p^{-1}(\Omega)$ with the following properties.*

(i) We have $dp(v_i) = \dfrac{\partial}{\partial t_i}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$ and $dp(v_m) = t_m \dfrac{\partial}{\partial t_m}$ on Ω.

(ii) On the open set $U \subset X$ as above we have

$$v_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{n+i}} + \sum_{j=1}^{q} \psi_i^j \left(b_{m+n} z_j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} - b_j z_{m+n} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{m+n}} \right) + \sum_{l=q+1}^{n} \psi_i^l \frac{\partial}{\partial z_l} \tag{9.47}$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$, well as

$$v_m = \frac{1}{b_{m+n}} z_{m+n} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{n+m}} + \sum_{j=1}^{q} \psi_m^j \left(b_{m+n} z_j \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} - b_j z_{m+n} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{m+n}} \right) + \sum_{l=q+1}^{n} \psi_m^l \frac{\partial}{\partial z_l}, \tag{9.48}$$

where the functions ψ_j^i are smooth on U.

Proof. The proof is straightforward: locally the lifting in (i) and (ii) clearly exist, given the structure of the map p. We glue them by a partition of unit; the logarithmic tangent bundle being invariant with respect to change of coordinates, the conclusion follows. □

We remark that in order to construct the vector fields as in Lemma 9.10 it is enough to assume the following:

(s_1) The singular values of the map p are contained in a snc divisor Δ;

(s_2) The inverse image $p^{-1}(\Delta)$ is a divisor W with snc support.

9.3. **Proof of Theorem 9.4.** We will follow the method of Viehweg-Zuo, cf. [36].
In order to simplify the writing, we introduce the following notation

$$E^s_{X/Y} := \mathcal{R}^s_\star \left(\Omega^{n-s}_{X/Y}\langle W\rangle \otimes L \right) \tag{9.49}$$

for $s \geq 0$.
Then for each $s \geq 0$ we have the holomorphic map

$$\tau^s : E^s_{X/Y} \to E^{s+1}_{X/Y} \otimes \Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \tag{9.50}$$

as recalled at the beginning of the current section. By hypothesis, there exists a section σ of the bundle

$$K_{X/Y} + W - p^\star(\Delta) + L \tag{9.51}$$

such that the map

$$ks^{(1)}_\sigma : \mathcal{O}_Y \to E^1_{X/Y} \otimes \Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle. \tag{9.52}$$

given by the cup-product of σ with the Kodaira-Spencer class is non-identically zero.
Then the proof of Theorem 9.8 is obtained as follows. Let

$$ks^{(j)}_\sigma : {}_Y \to E^j_{X/Y} \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^j\, \Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \tag{9.53}$$

be the map deduced from the iterated Kodaira-Spencer map (9.16).

We denote by Π_j the projection

$$E^j_{X/Y} \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^j\, \Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \to \left(E^j_{X/Y}/\mathcal{K}^j \right) \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^j\, \Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle, \tag{9.54}$$

and let i be the smallest integer such that $\Pi_i \circ ks^{(i)}_\sigma$ is identically zero. This means that the image of $ks^{(i)}_\sigma$ is contained in

$$\mathcal{K}^i \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^i\, \Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle \tag{9.55}$$

and that $ks^{(i)}_\sigma$ is not identically zero. Indeed, if $ks^{(i)}_\sigma$ would be zero, then the image of $ks^{(i-1)}_\sigma$ is contained in $\mathcal{K}^{i-1} \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^{i-1}\, \Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle$. This contradicts our choice of i.

Note that we have $i \geq 1$ thanks to the assumption $(\mathcal{H})_3$. We obtain a non-identically zero section of the bundle (9.55). This in turn defines a non-trivial map

$$\mathcal{K}^{i\star}_f \to \mathrm{Sym}^i\, \Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle. \tag{9.56}$$

since the dual of $\mathcal{K}^i$ is the same as the dual of $\mathcal{K}^i_f$. We remark that this already shows that the bundle $\mathrm{Sym}^i\,\Omega^1_Y\langle\Delta\rangle$ has a semi-positively curved subsheaf (i.e. the image of the map (9.56)).

If the curvature of (L, h_L) satisfies the hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_2)$ and if moreover there exists an open subset $\Omega \subset Y$ together with a positive $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\Theta_{h_L}(L) \leq -\varepsilon_0 p^\star(\omega_Y)$$

on $p^{-1}(\Omega)$, then the curvature properties of the kernels $\mathcal{K}^i s$ are considerably better:

• The sheaf $\mathcal{K}^i$ is admits a singular semi-negatively curved Hermitian metric which is smooth on a Zariski open subset of Y.

• For any local holomorphic section $[u_t]$ of the bundle $\mathcal{K}^i|_\Omega$ we have

$$dd^c \log \|[u]\|^2 \geq \varepsilon_0 \sum_{j=1}^m \sqrt{-1} dt_j \wedge d\bar{t}_j. \tag{9.57}$$

In this context we recall the following result, which concludes the proof of the last part of Theorem 9.4.

Let Y be a smooth projective variety, and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a torsion free coherent sheaf on Y. We consider $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}) := \mathcal{P}roj(\bigoplus_{m\geq 0} S^m(\mathcal{F}))$ the scheme over Y associated to $\mathcal{F}$, together with the projection $\pi : \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}) \to Y$. We denote by $_{\mathcal{F}}(1)$ be the tautological line bundle on $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F})$. Let $Y_1 \subset Y$ be a Zariski open subset on which $\mathcal{F}$ is locally free (in particular $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F})$ is smooth over Y_1) and $\mathrm{codim}_Y(Y \setminus Y_1) \geq 2$.

The following statement is established in [26].

Theorem 9.11. [26] *We suppose that $_{\mathcal{F}}(1)|_{\pi^{-1}(Y_1)}$ admits a singular Hermitian metric g with semi-positive curvature, and that there exists a point $y \in Y_1$ such that $\mathcal{I}(g^k|_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_y)}) = {}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_y)}$ for any $k > 0$, where $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{F}_y) = \pi^{-1}(y)$. Assume moreover that there exists an open neighborhood Ω of y such that $\Theta_g\left((1)\right) - \pi^\star\omega_Y \geq 0$ on $\pi^{-1}(\Omega)$. Then $\mathcal{F}$ is big.*

This result together with the properties of the kernels $\mathcal{K}^j_f$ summarized in the bullets above show that each of $\mathcal{K}^j_f$ is big; in particular this applies to $\mathcal{K}^i_f$. □

Remark 15. The hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_i)$ (for $i = 1, 2$) together with the existence of a section σ of $K_{X/Y} + W - p^\star(\Delta) + L$ have a few consequences on the map p itself which we will now discuss. We write

$$K_{X/Y} = L_1 - L \tag{9.58}$$

where $L_1 := \big(K_{X/Y} + W - p^\star(\Delta) + L\big) + p^\star(\Delta) - W$. In particular, L_1 is an effective line bundle. As for $-L$, it is semi-positive and strictly positive/trivial on the fibers of p. Therefore, the relative canonical bundle $K_{X/Y}$ is relatively big in the first case, and pseudo-effective in the second.

If moreover the curvature of L verifies the requirements in the second part of Theorem 9.4, then for any m large enough the bundle $\det p_\star(mK_{X/Y})$ is big. From this perspective, Theorem 9.4 is similar to (but slightly weaker than) the main statement of Popa-Schnell in [28]. □

9.4. **Metrics on the relative canonical bundle.** In this section we will establish the following result; afterwards we will show that it implies Theorem 9.5.

Theorem 9.12. *Let $p : X \to Y$ be an algebraic fiber space, and let ω be a fixed, reference metric on X. We assume that the following properties are satisfied.*

(1) The canonical bundle of the generic fiber of p is ample.

(2) There exists a positive $m \gg 0$ such that the line bundle

$$\det p_\star(mK_{X/Y})$$

is big.

Then there exists a singular metric $h_{X/Y} = e^{-\varphi_{X/Y}}$ on $K_{X/Y}$ such that:

(i) There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ for which we have $dd^c\varphi_{X/Y} \geq \varepsilon_0\omega$ in the sense of currents on X, i.e. the curvature of $(K_{X/Y}, h_{X/Y})$ is strongly positive.

(ii) The restriction $h_{X/Y}|_{X_y}$ is non-singular for each $y \in B$, where B is a Zariski open subset of Y (which can be described in a precise manner).

Before presenting the arguments of the proof, a few comments about the preceding statement.

Remark 16. If instead of the hypothesis (1) above we assume that K_{X_y} is big, then the metric $e^{-\varphi_{X/Y}}$ can be constructed so that it has the same singularities as the *metric with minimal singularities* on this bundle. It would be really interesting to develop the techniques in sections (1)-(6) under the assumption that the bundle L is endowed with a sequence of smooth metrics h_ε such that the curvature θ_ε admits a lower bound

$$\theta_\varepsilon \geq (\varepsilon_0 - \lambda_\varepsilon)\omega$$

where $C > 0$ and λ_ε is a family of positive functions uniformly bounded from above and converging to zero almost everywhere. □

Remark 17. If the Kodaira dimension of the fibers of p is not maximal we can derive a similar result –of course, the conclusion (i) has to be modified accordingly. However, in the absence of the hypothesis (2) it is not clear what we can expect. □

Proof. The arguments which will follow rely on two results. We recall next the first one, cf. [19].

Theorem 9.13. [19] *Let $p : X \to Y$ be an algebraic fiber space, and let $L \to X$ be a line bundle such that the restriction $L|_{X_y}$ is ample, for any $y \in Y$ in a Zariski open set. Then there exists an ample line bundle A_Y on Y such that $L + p^\star A_Y$ is ample on X.*

The second result we need is much more involved technically, as follows.

Theorem 9.14. [8] *We assume that K_X is pseudo-effective. For any positive integer m there exists a real number $\eta_0 > 0$ and a divisor Ξ on X such that the codimension of $p(\Xi)$ is at least two, and such that the difference*

$$K_{X/Y} + \Xi - \eta_0 p^\star \left(\det\left(p_\star(mK_{X/Y})\right)\right) \tag{9.59}$$

is pseudo-effective.

Actually what we will use is not this result in itself, but its proof –this will be needed in order to establish (ii) above. Hence the plan for the remaining part of this subsection is to review the main parts of the proof as in [8] (see also the references therein), and to extract the statement we want –this concerns the singularities of the current in (9.59).

• If the map p is a smooth submersion, then the arguments in [8] are borrowed from Viehweg's weak semi-stability theorem proof, cf. [34]. The first observation is that given any vector bundle E of rank r we have a canonical injection

$$\det(E) \to \otimes^r E, \tag{9.60}$$

and hence a nowhere vanishing section of the bundle

$$\otimes^r E \otimes (\det(E))^\star . \tag{9.61}$$

We apply this to the direct image

$$E := p_\star \left(m_0 K_{X/Y} \right) \tag{9.62}$$

which is indeed a vector bundle, by the invariance of plurigenera [32]. Here m is a positive integer, large enough so that the multiple $m_0 K_{X_t}$ is very ample, and r is the rank of the direct image (9.62).

In this case the bundle $\otimes^r E$ can be interpreted as direct image of the relative pluricanonical bundle of the map

$$p^{(r)} : X^{(r)} \to Y \tag{9.63}$$

where $X^{(r)} := X \times_Y \cdots \times_Y X$ is the r^{th} fibered product corresponding to the map $p : X \; to Y$. Note that $X^{(r)} \subset \times^r X$ is a non-singular submanifold of the r-fold product of X with itself (thanks to the assumption that p is a submersion).

The important observation is that we have the formulas

$$p^{(r)}_\star \left(m_0 K_{X^{(r)}/Y} \right) = \otimes^r p_\star \left(m_0 K_{X/Y} \right) \tag{9.64}$$

as well as

$$K_{X^{(r)}/Y} = \prod \pi_i^\star (K_{X/Y}) \tag{9.65}$$

where $\pi_i : X^{(r)} \to X$ is induced by the projection on the i^{th} factor.

By relations (9.61) and (9.64) we have a section, say σ, of the bundle

$$m_0 K_{X^{(r)}/Y} - p^{(r)\star} \left(\det p_\star \left(m_0 K_{X/Y} \right) \right) . \tag{9.66}$$

The formula (9.65) shows that the restriction of the bundle $K_{X^{(r)}/Y}$ to the diagonal $X \subset X^{(r)}$ is precisely $r K_{X/Y}$, so all in all the restriction of the bundle in (9.66) to X coincides with (9.59). However, we cannot use directly the section σ in order to conclude, since by construction we have $\sigma|_X \equiv 0$.

To bypass this difficulty, we will use the following superb trick invented by E. Viehweg, cf. [34]. Let $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ be a small enough positive rational number such that the pair

$$\left(X^{(r)}, B \right) \tag{9.67}$$

is klt, where the boundary $B := \varepsilon_0 Z_\sigma$ is the ε_0 multiple of the divisor $Z_\sigma := (\sigma = 0)$.

The next step is to apply the results in [5] and deduce that there exists a fixed ample line bundle A_Y on Y such that for any $k \geq 1$ divisible enough the restriction map

$$H^0\left(X^{(r)}, k\left(K_{X^{(r)}/Y} + B\right) + p^{(r)\star}A_Y\right) \to H^0\big(X_y^{(r)}, k(K_{X_y^{(r)}} + B|_{X_y^{(r)}})\big) \tag{9.68}$$

is surjective, for any $y \in Y \setminus \Delta$. Now the bundle on the right hand side of (9.68) is equal to

$$k(1+\varepsilon_0 m_0)\prod_{i=1}^{r}\pi_i^{\star}\left(K_{X_y}\right), \tag{9.69}$$

so it has many sections, given that K_{X_y} is ample. Moreover, all the sections in question are automatically $L^{2/k}$ integrable, given that $(X^{(r)}, B)$ is a klt pair, and so it is its restriction to a generic fiber $X_y^{(r)}$ of our map $p^{(r)}$. For the complete argument concerning the surjectivity of the map (9.68) we are referring to [8] (and the references therein).

In particular, for each k divisible enough the bundle

$$k\left(K_{X^{(r)}/Y} + B\right) + p^{(r)\star}A_Y \tag{9.70}$$

admits a holomorphic section whose restriction to the diagonal $X \subset X^{(r)}$ is not identically zero. Indeed, we have (many) sections of the bundle (9.68) on fiber $X_y \times \cdots \times X_y$ whose restriction to the diagonal $X_y \subset X_y \times \cdots \times X_y$ is not identically zero.

In conclusion, this shows the existence of a positively-curved metric on the bundle

$$r(1+\varepsilon_0 m_0)K_{X/Y} - \varepsilon_0 p^{\star}\det\left(p_{\star}(m_0 K_{X/Y})\right) + \frac{1}{k}p^{\star}A_Y \tag{9.71}$$

whose restriction to the generic fiber X_y of p is induced by the sections of multiples of K_{X_y}.

• The general case where p is simply a surjective map is much more involved; the complications are arising from the fact that the fibered product $X^{(r)}$ is no longer smooth. However, as shown in [8] one obtains a similar result, modulo adding the divisor Ξ which projects in codimension greater than two. We will not reproduce here the proof, but just mention that modulo the singularities of $X^{(r)}$, the structure of the argument is identical to the case detailed at the preceding bullet –in particular, we control the singularities of the restriction of the metric on (9.71) to the generic fiber X_y.

Remark 18. It would be really interesting to have a more direct proof of Theorem 9.14, i.e. without using Viehweg's trick. □

We combine next the previous results and give next a complete argument for Theorem 9.12. Recall that we we have an integer m_0 above such that the following conditions are satisfied.

(i) The bundle $m_0 K_{X_y}$ is very ample.

(ii) The bundle $\det\left(p_{\star}(m_0 K_{X/Y})\right)$ is big.

By Theorem 9.13 the bundle

$$K_{X/Y} + p^{\star}A_Y \tag{9.72}$$

is ample on X, for some ample bundle A_Y on Y. Without loss of generality, we can assume that this bundle coincides with the one in (9.71). By the point (ii) above, there exists a positive integer $m_1 \gg 0$ such that

$$m_1 \det \left(p_\star(m_0 K_{X/Y})\right) \simeq A_Y + E_Y \tag{9.73}$$

and thus the bundle

$$K_{X/Y} + m_1 p^\star \det \left(p_\star(m_0 K_{X/Y})\right) \tag{9.74}$$

admits a metric whose curvature is equal to $\omega_X + p^\star E_Y$, where ω_X is a (smooth) Kähler metric on X.

Moreover, by adjusting the parameter k in (9.71) we obtain a metric on the bundle

$$m_2 K_{X/Y} - m_1 p^\star \det \left(p_\star(m_0 K_{X/Y})\right) \tag{9.75}$$

for some $m_2 \geq 1$ which is semi-positively curved and whose restriction to the generic fiber is smooth.

Finally, the metric $h_{X/Y}$ in Theorem 9.12 is constructed by multiplying the metrics on the bundles (9.74) and (9.75) and extracting the $(1+m_2)^{\text{th}}$ root. □

9.5. **Proof of Theorem 9.5.** The hypothesis of 9.5 together with the results in [18], [15], [28] that for each $m \gg 0$ the bundle

$$\det \left(p_\star(m K_{X/Y})\right) \tag{9.76}$$

is big. This can equally be obtained along the line of arguments in this paper as follows. It is shown in [4] that the curvature form of the vector bundle $p_\star(mK_{X/Y})$ has no zero eigenvalue –as if not, the "maximal variation" hypothesis would be contradicted. Thus the curvature form of its determinant is semi-positive, and strictly positive at some point. The fact that it is big follows e.g. by holomorphic Morse inequalities. We now apply Theorem 9.12 and 9.5 is proved.

9.6. **Proof of Theorem 9.8.** This is almost a linear combination of the results obtained in the previous sections: we define the L as follows

$$L := -K_{X/Y} + \sum (t^i - 1) W_i \tag{9.77}$$

so that the bundle (9.51) is trivial (in particular, it has a section).

We intend to use Theorem 9.4 in order to conclude, but we do not seem to prove that the bundle (9.77) admits a metric satisfying the hypothesis $(\mathcal{H}_2)$. However, in Corollary 9.7 we construct a family of metrics whose curvature properties represent an approximation of this hypothesis. We will show next that we can adapt the proof of Theorem 9.5, and obtain the same conclusion by using Corollary 9.7 instead of $(\mathcal{H}_2)$.

We will denote by h_L the metric on (9.77) induced by the metric $h^{(1)}_{X/Y}$. Note that the curvature current corresponding to this metric is semi-positive on X, and strictly positive on generic fibers of p by Theorem 9.6.

Let $[u_t]$ be a local holomorphic section of the bundle $\mathcal{K}^i$, defined on the open co-ordinate subset $V \subset Y$ centered at a generic point of Δ. We have to show that the quantity

$$\sup_{t\in V\setminus\Delta} \log \|[u_t]\|_t^2 < \infty \tag{9.78}$$

is finite. To this end, we follow the same path as in the proof of 9.2, so we will only highlight the main differences next.

By Corollary 9.7 we have

$$h_L|_{X_t} = \lim_{\eta\to 0} h^{(\eta)\star}_{X/Y}|_{X_t} \tag{9.79}$$

for each $t \in V \setminus \Delta$. For each $0 < \varepsilon \ll \eta$, we define the perturbation $h_{L,(\varepsilon,\eta)}$ of the metric $h^{(\eta)\star}_{X/Y}$ precisely as in (9.34) (meaning that h_L in (9.34) is replaced with $h^{(\eta)\star}_{X/Y}$ in the actual context). Then we have

$$\sup_{t\in V\setminus\Delta} |t_m|^{C\eta}\|[u_t]\|^2_{t,(\varepsilon,\eta)} \leq C(\varepsilon, u) < \infty, \tag{9.80}$$

where C in (9.80) is a fixed constant, large enough compared with the multiplicities t^i in the expression of the divisor $p^{-1}(\Delta)$. The inequality (9.80) above is established by the same procedure as the proof of the Claim –the only slight difference here is the presence of a factor of order (η) with the wrong sign in the metric $h^{(\eta)\star}_{X/Y}$, accounting for the first negative term in the curvature estimate (a) in Corollary 9.7. This term in tamed by the factor $|t_m|^{C\eta}$. The inequality (9.80) together with the mean inequality show that (9.78) hold true.

Hence, under the hypothesis of Theorem 9.8 the conclusion of theorems 9.2 and 9.4, respectively hold true provided that the bundle (L, h_L) is chosen as in (9.77) above. This is the end.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Aubin, *Équations du type Monge-Ampère sur les varietés kählériennes compactes*, Bull. Sci. Math. **102** (1978), 63–95.

[2] C. Bănică and O. Stănăşilă, *Algebraic methods in the global theory of complex spaces*, John Wiley and Sons, New York (1976).

[3] B. Berndtsson, *Curvature of vector bundles associated to holomorphic fibrations*, Ann. Math. **169** (2009), 531–560.

[4] B. Berndtsson, *Strict and nonstrict positivity of direct image bundles*, Math. Z. **269** (2011), 1201–1218.

[5] B. Berndtsson and M. Păun, *Bergman kernel and the pseudo-effectivity of relative canonical bundles*, Duke Math. J. **145** (2008), 341–378.

[6] B. Berndtsson and G. Schumacher, *Curvature of Weil-Petersson metrics*, in preparation.

[7] Y. Brunebarbe, *Symmetric differentials and variations of Hodge structures*, to appear in Crelle's Journal.

[8] J. Cao, M. Păun, *Kodaira dimension of algebraic fiber spaces over abelian varieties*, arXiv 1504.01095, to appear in Inv. Math.

[9] E. Cattani, A. Kaplan, W. Schmid, *Degeneration of Hodge structures*, Ann. of Math. (2) **123** (1986), no. 3, 457–535.

[10] P. Deligne, *Équations différentielles à points singuliers réguliers*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 163, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970

[11] P. Griffiths, J. Harris, *Principles of algebraic geometry*, John Wiley and Sons, 2014.

[12] P. Griffiths, L. Tu, *Curvature properties of the Hodge bundles*, Topics in transcendental algebraic geometry (Princeton, N.J., 1981/1982), 29–49, Ann. of Math. Stud., 106, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1984.

[13] O. Fujino, T. Fujisawa, *On semipositivity theorems*, arXiv:1701.02039, 2016.

[14] L. Hörmander, *An introduction to complex analysis in several variables*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, 1966.

[15] Y. Kawamata, *Kodaira dimension of algebraic fiber spaces over curves* Invent. Math. **66** (1982), no. 1, 57–71.

[16] S. Kebekus, S. Kovács, *Families of canonically polarized varieties over surfaces*, Invent. Math. **172** (2008), no. 3, 657–682.

[17] K. Kodaira and D. C. Spencer, *On deformations of complex analytic structures, III. Stability theorems for complex structures*, Ann. Math. **71** (1960), 43–76.

[18] J. Kollár, *Subadditivity of the Kodaira dimension: fibers of general type*, Algebraic geometry, Sendai, 1985, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., vol. 10, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987, 361–398.

[19] J. Kollár and S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambridge University Press.

[20] L. Lempert and R. Szöke, *Direct Images, Fields of Hilbert Spaces, and Geometric Quantization*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **327** (2014), 49–99.

[21] K. Liu and X. Yang, *Curvatures of direct image sheaves of vector bundles and applications*, J. Diff. Geom. **98** (2014), 117–145.

[22] C. Mourougane, S. Takayama, *Hodge metrics and positivity of direct images*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **606** (2007), 167–178.

[23] C. Mourougane, S. Takayama, *Hodge metrics and the curvature of higher direct images*, Ann. Sci. ENS. **41** (2008), 905–924.

[24] P. Naumann, *Curvature of higher direct images*. arXiv, 1611.09117

[25] M. Păun, *Relative adjoint transcendental classes and Albanese maps of compact Kähler manifolds with Nef Ricci curvature.* arxiv: 1209.2915

[26] M. Păun, S. Takayama *Positivity of relative twisted pluricanonical bundles and their direct images.* arxiv: 1409.5504

[27] M. Popa and L. Wu, *Weak positivity for Hodge modules*, arXiv:1511.00290.

[28] M. Popa and C. Schnell, *Viehweg's hyperbolicity conjecture for families with maximal variation*, arxiv: 1511.00294, to appear in Inv. Math.

[29] M. H. Protter and H. F. Weinberger, *Maximum principles in differential equations*, Springer Science and Business Media, 2012.

[30] G. Schumacher, *Positivity of relative canonical bundles and applications*, Invent. Math. **190** (2012), 1–56.

[31] Y. T. Siu, *Curvature of the Weil-Petersson metric in the moduli space of compact Kähler-Einstein manifolds of negative first Chern class.* Contributions to several complex variables, 261-298, Aspects Math., E9, Vieweg, Braunschweig, 1986.

[32] Y. T. Siu, *Extension of twisted pluricanonical sections with plurisubharmonic weight and invariance of semipositively twisted plurigenera for manifolds not necessarily of general type*, Complex geometry (Göttingen, 2000), 223–277, Springer, Berlin, 2002.

[33] W. K. To and S. K. Yeung, *Finsler Metrics and Kobayashi hyperbolicity of the moduli spaces of canonically polarized manifolds*, Ann. Math. **181** (2015), 547–586.

[34] E. Viehweg *Quasi-Projective moduli for polarized manifolds*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics.

[35] E. Viehweg and K. Zuo, *Base spaces of non-isotrivial families of smooth minimal models*, Complex geometry (Göttingen, 2000), Springer, Berlin, 2002, pp. 279–328.

[36] E. Viehweg and K. Zuo, *On the Brody hyperbolicity of moduli spaces for canonically polarized manifolds*, Duke Math. J. **118** (2003), 103–150

[37] X. Wang, *A curvature formula associated to a family of pseudoconvex domains*, Ann. Inst. Fourier, to appear.

[38] X. Wang, *Curvature of higher direct image sheaves and its application on negative-curvature criterion for the Weil-Petersson metric*, arXiv: 1607.03265 [math.CV].

[39] X. Wang, *Relative $\bar{\partial}$-complex and its curvature properties*, arXiv: 1607.03634 [math.CV].

[40] K. Zuo, *On the negativity of kernels of Kodaira?Spencer maps on Hodge bundles and applications*, Asian J. Math. **4** (2000), no. 1, 279–301.

[41] S.-T. Yau, *On the Ricci curvature of a compact Kähler manifold and the complex Monge-Ampére equation I*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **31** (1978), 339–411.

BO BERNDTSSON
CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
GÖTEBORG UNIVERSITY
E-mail address: bob@chalmers.se

MIHAI PĂUN
KOREA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY,
SEOUL, 130-722 SOUTH KOREA
E-mail address: paun@kias.re.kr

MIHAI PĂUN
DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT CHICAGO
851 S. MORGAN STREET
CHICAGO IL 60607-7045, US
E-mail address: mpaun@uic.edu

XU WANG
CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
GÖTEBORG UNIVERSITY
E-mail address: xuwa@chalmers.se